

33

A

REPLY

By T. W. Citizen of Chester,

To a VINDICATION of

Mr. M. H's Brief Enquiry into the true Nature of
Schism, from the Exceptions of T. W. &c. By a
Person who conceals his Name.

THE Prince of Peace Blessed for ever, laid this Command upon his Disciples, *Mark 9. v. 50. Have Peace one with another*; and that this Command may have the deeper impression in their minds, he left it as his Legacy, *Joh. 14 v. 27. Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you*; how numerous soever they might in all Succeeding Ages come to be, this was to be the Badge and Character by which his Disciples were to be known to the world, and to one another: now whosoever he be that in any Case violates this Command, and sets at naught this Legacy, is no longer a Disciple of the Holy Jesus the Prince of Peace, unless he repent and return.

Yet notwithstanding all this, there has scarce any Age since the Church of Christ had a being, been free from some or other, who have pretended to be the Disciples of Christ in an extraordinary manner, and yet have had no regard to this holy Command, nor any value or esteem for this Sacred Legacy.

For they are most notoriously Guilty of breaking this Law, and contemning this Legacy, who revile and oppose that Government of the Church which was instituted by our Blessed Saviour, founded in his Apostles, and convey'd by them to their Successor, and so has continued in a right Succession

DD



4135.aaa 17

M

m
pe
A
D
cy
L
lel

of
to
ha
Sa

ter
wh
con

33

A

REPLY

By T. W. Citizen of Chester,

To a VINDICATION of

Mr. M. H's Brief Enquiry into the true Nature of
Schism, from the Exceptions of T. W. &c. By a
Person who conceals his Name.

THE Prince of Peace Blessed for ever, laid this Command upon his Disciples, *Mark 9. v. 50. Have Peace one with another*; and that this Command might have the deeper impression in their minds, he left it as his Legacy, *Joh. 14 v. 27. Peace I leave with you, my peace I give unto you*; how numerous soever they might in all Succeeding Ages come to be, this was to be the Badge and Character by which his Disciples were to be known to the world, and to one another: now whosoever he be that in any Case violates this Command, and sets at naught this Legacy, is no longer a Disciple of the Holy Jesus the Prince of Peace, unless he repent and return.

Yet notwithstanding all this, there has scarce any Age since the Church of Christ had a being, been free from some or other, who have pretended to be the Disciples of Christ in an extraordinary manner, and yet have had no regard to this holy Command, nor any value or esteem for this Sacred Legacy.

For they are most notoriously Guilty of breaking this Law, and contemning this Legacy, who revile and oppose that Government of the Church which was instituted by our Blessed Saviour; founded in his Apostles, and convey'd by them to their Successors, and so has continued in a right Suc-
cession

cession to this present time ; of this sort our Dissenters in *England* are, and some or other of them, are frequently putting out Pamphlets wherein they endeavour to acquit themselves of this great Crime by Justifying their Separation from the Government of the Church.

To this purpose Mr. *M. H-ry* Printed a Pamphlet the last year, which he called, *a brief Enquiry into the true Nature of Schism* ; there was not much more of the Nature of Schism, than of the Philosophers Stone in it ; however the not Answering it gave it the more Credit, and swell'd his Disciples with Triumph, so as some of them boasted in my hearing, that it could not be answered by any Clergy-man ; this made me uneasy, and considering how unsuitable it was to any Clergy-man to concern himself with it, and withal considering, that this might be an Argument to profelitate the weak and more unstable people. I under took it in hopes that the Catholic truths laid down (tho' by so mean and weak a hand) might put a Stop to their boasting, and it had these effects : First, few believed but that it was done by some Clergy-man who prevail'd with me, to print it in my name. And secondly, that Mr. *M. H-ry* for all the fulness of Gifts his Disciples boasted to be in him, thought as I may reasonably (from his calling in aid) suppose it was above his Talent to meddle with.

Now left the neglect of a Reply should be fatal to them, and stagger their blind Profelytes in *Chester*, and parts adjacent ; they sought and found out a man of great Size to attack me, a chosen Vessel, one of the First rate, who has fired all his Guns at me, and shot a great deal of Venom, and little else, which I hope in this following Paper shall make to appear.

This great man conceals his Name, and perhaps not without good reason. In the front of his Book he tells us, *That man must be a great stranger in England, who knows not what unhappy Flames have been kindled among us about matters of Church Government and Worship ; and he must be as great an Enemy that would not contribute his utmost to the extinguishing of them ; a great deal has been writ on both sides, to convince the world where the fault of our Division lies.*

The Government of the Church by Episcopacy is of Divine Institution.

That the Government of the Church by Episcopacy was of Apostolic Institution and Ordination is evident, for that *Timothy* was made Bishop of *Ephesus*, and *Titus* of *Crete* by Apostolical Ordination and Institution, is very clear in *St. Paul's* Epistles to them both. That the seven Cities in *Asia* which received the Christian Faith, had each City a Bishop, is evident by the Title *St. John* gives in his Letters to them, contain'd in the Second and Third Chapters in the *Revelations*.

And that after the Apostles time, wherever the Christian Faith was received



ceived in the early Ages of Christianity, this *Government* was set over them, and that then all Christians own'd and submitted to this *Government*, is sufficiently proved by the concurrent Testimonies of all the Fathers in those Primitive times, and from those times this *Government* received no interruption, nor was at any time controverted or questioned, except by *Aerius*, *Ischyas*, and one or two more, (who were condemned for Schismatics) till the last Age, and then by this sort of Men, by setting up a new mistaken Notion of *Parochial and Congregational Episcopacy* with *Lay Elders*, to share in the *Government of the Church*, never heard of before.

To *Church Government* disputed, he adds *Worship*, (by which I suppose he means the *Worship of God*) which chiefly consists, of the unfeigned belief of the *Articles of Faith* deliver'd by the *Apostles*; the Offering up *Prayers*, *Intercessions*, *Thanksgiving* and *Praises* unto *God Almighty*, according to his *Will* declared in the *Holy Scripture*; presented in the name of his *Son*, *Christ Jesus*, with all *Reverence* and *Humility* and *Gestures* expressing the same, the word of *God* read and duly and truly preach'd; the holy *Sacraments* *Baptism* and the *Eucharist* rightly and duly administred.

The Worship of God in the Church of England, as pure as in any other Church whatsoever.

Now all this is done with as much *Reverence* and *Gravity*, *Simplicity* and *Gospel purity* in the *Church of England* as in any *Church whatsoever*; own'd to be so, and highly honored and esteem'd for it, among all the *Reformed Churches*, except those men of *Violence*, your *Brethren of the Kirk of Scotland*, with whom we have nothing to do, only to pray for them.

They of *Rome* indeed, were the only men who first oppos'd the reformed *Dissenters* *Worship* of our *Church*; purified and cleansed from their *Innovations* and *kindled* *Corruptions* as it stands established both by *Canon* and *Statute Laws*; and the *flames* these *Dissenters* have pursued Their *Game*, and in this made themselves of *Divisive* Their *Partners* by continuing and increasing those *Flames* to this day, not without hopes to compleat what the *Papist* so much endeavour'd, and still with these men earnestly desire, viz. the overturning and suppressing of this reformed *Worship*. So the *Flames* were kindled by the *Papists* first, and then by these men, by their *Disputing* and *Arraigning* the *Established* *Worship*.

The *Church Government* and *Worship* being thus stated, it easily appears, that the *Dissenters* in *England* are they who kindled the *unhappy flames* (this *Gent.* talks of) among us. Now let us see how they may be *extinguished*, where the *fault* lies? and who are the *Enemies* that will not contribute their utmost to quench them?

Men who are not mad, will go far for *Water* to quench those *Flames*

They will not contribute to quench them. which else would destroy their dwellings, but these men need go no farther but do their duty and the flames are out. To disobey the Orders of our Governors, is to transgress a plain Law of God. If these men have any thing imposed on them by our Governors that is sinful let them shew it, and their Plea must be allow'd, but they are forced to confess the Terms of Obedience impos'd, are but *indifferent things, mere trifles*; Now for a man to disobey his Governors and have no other plea but this, it is too mean to excuse him from the transgression of a known Law. Obey them that have the Rule

Heb. 13. over you is the command of the holy Apostle. Nor can *indifferent things*, or what they acknowledg, *mere trifles*, be a pretence sufficient to bind the Conscience, against an express Law of God, for as if the blessed Apostle had foreseen these mens Plea; he Commands Obedience to our Governors for Conscience sake, Rom. 13. 5. I hope by what is said, it will be allowed by all impartial men, and sound Christians, that I may conclude without breach of Charity, that the Dissenters in England, are they who kindle the unhappy Flames about Church Government and Worship, and that they are the great Enemies that will not contribute the least (not so much as do their Duty) to quench them; and that (notwithstanding all the Writing he talks of) the fault of all our Divisions lies at their door.

He goes on; The word Schism has been toss'd like a Tennis-ball, from one side to another, till by such motion those violent heats have been caused that have much endangered both our Church and State.

By this Rhetoric I suppose is meant the Opposition and Disputes made by these men against the established Church of England; that by these means, these men not only endangered, but for some years involved both Church and State in Ruin and Desolation; had I brought no arguments, yet by sad experience is sufficiently proved.

He says, Great endeavours have been used to fasten the Guilt upon such as impose unnecessary and suspected Terms of Communion, and it has been as fiercely retorted upon those who comply not with those Terms.

Here the Terms of Communion are Unnecessary and Suspected (only;) but who are to be Judges of what things are necessary, or what Unnecessary, they that bear Rule over us, or they that owe Subjection? Government always implies Subjection; and how can bare suspicion discharge a man from the duty of Obedience? This is certain, that if a Father command his Son to do something which is in it self not Unlawful, and if the Son tell his Father it is Unnecessary, and that he Suspects it to be so, and if only for that Reason will not obey, that Son is a Transgressor against the fifth Commandment; and its as certain that this is truly applicable to these men; all their Expositors affirm, that Obedience to their lawful Rulers &

Pastors

Pastors, is required by that Commandment. But because the whole Controversie which these Dissenters, have against our Church mainly depends on these two particulars mentioned by this Gent. viz. *Church Government and Worship*, it will be very necessary to lay down some irrefragable Instances to prove what was the Practice of the Church, in respect of its Government in the times next after the Apostles; and this I do because by referring thereto, I shall answer many passages which follow in this Gentlemans Book.

Episcopacy the Government of the Church in the times next after the Apostles.

I begin with the Canon of the Apostles, which I find thus Translated by a person of great worth, both for Learning and Veracity: "Let not the Presbyters or Deacons do any thing without the Consent of the Bishop, for he hath the people of the Lord intrusted to him, and there shall one day be required of him an account of their Souls. Here the Bishop has the Power of Governing the Presbyters and Deacons. Of what Authority these Canons are, *Jusellus* has made evident, in his account of the Code of the Universal Church.

Clemens Romanus who was an Adjutor of the Apostles, and as *Linus* Succeeded *St. Peter*, and *Cletus Linus*, so he Succeeded *Cletus* in the Bishopric of *Rome*, where all others in Holy Orders were called Presbyters, except Deacons only; who speaking of the Apostles in his *Ep. ad Corinth. p. 57.* saith, "That they foreseeing that there would be Contentions and Emulations about the Name or Dignity of Bishop, or Episcopacy, they set down a List or continuation of Successors, that when any dyed, such a certain person should Succeed him.

Ignatius Bishop of *Antioch* and Martyr, who saw Jesus and liv'd in the Apostles age, whose Authority many of later times, Enemies to Episcopacy, have opposed yet never could suppress the plainness of it. In his *Epistle* to the *Smyrneans*, he saith, "But avoid Divisions as the beginning of evils, and be all of you observant of the Bishop, as Jesus Christ was observant of the Father; and observe the Presbyters as the Apostles; and reverence the Deacons as the Command of God. Let no man presume to do any thing in the Church without the Bishop. And let that Eucharist only be accounted firm, which is either performed by the Bishop himself, or by his Licence. And a little further; He who honoreth the Bishop honoreth God; but he who doth any thing without the Bishop's approbation, performs a Service to Satan, &c.

In his *Epistle* to the *Ephesians*: "Therefore (pursuant to something before) it becomes you every way to glorifie Jesus Christ who glorifies you, that being perfected and knit up in the same Subjection, and being of one mind

“ mind, and of one judgment, you may all speak the same things, and
 “ being Subject to the Bishop, (which *Oneſimus* then was) and the Presby-
 “ ters, may be Sanctify'd in all things. Again in the same Epistle, “ As
 “ Jesus Christ himself who is our incomparable life did follow the judgment
 “ of the Father; and the Bishops who are designed to the ends of the Earth,
 “ follow the judgment of Jesus Christ; therefore it is a comely thing for
 “ you to concur in the judgment of the Bishop, as also you do; for your
 “ Presbyters most worthy of Praise and of God, is so adapted to the Bishop,
 “ as strings are fitted to the Harp, insomuch that Jesus Christ is Celebrated
 “ through your unanimity and agreement in Love. And in the same Ep.
 “ Therefore let us endeavour to be in subjection to the Bishops, that
 “ we may be Gods Subjects.

In his Epistle to the *Magnesiums*; “ For I was accounted worthy to see
 “ *Damas* your Divine Bishop, and the worthy Presbyters *Bassus* and *Apollin-*
 “ *us*, and *Sotion* the Deacon, my Fellow-servant, whom I would enjoy,
 “ because he is subject to the Bishop as to the Grace of God, and to the
 “ Presbyters as to the Law of Jesus Christ. A little further he saith; “ For
 “ some indeed there are, who own the Bishop in name, but do all things
 “ without him: such men appear to me, to be men of no good Conscience,
 “ because they hold Meetings not established by Commandment, &c.

I could heap up many more Instances, but that would be tedious; I will
 therefore conclude with the Council of *Laodicea*, *Can. 55.* which I find by
 an eminent Doctor in our Church, thus Translated. *The Presbyters must*
do nothing without the Consent of the Bishop.

That the Authority I have brought to prove, that the ancient Government
 of the Christian Church was by Bishops and (that it was an Order Superior
 and had power of Jurisdiction over the Presbyters and Deacons) should be
 undeniably and firmly receiv'd and Submitted to, by all Christians, I offer
 these Reasons.

1 *First*, It was this same Authority which gather'd all the writings of the
 Evangelists and Apostles, and declar'd them to be the word of God, the
 dictates of the Holy Ghost, and all Christians have so receiv'd them and
 do hold them to be Canonical and use them and reverence them as such to
 this very day.

2 It was by the same Authority, that the first day of the week was De-
 clared to be the Lords Day (there being no Precept Commanding it in
 Scripture) and all Christians have yeilded Obedience to it, and do set a-
 part that Day to Celebrate the Worship of God in a most Solemn manner
 as if Commanded by Holy Scripture.

3 And lastly, this Authority of the Ancient Fathers and first General
 Councils

Councils, which affirm the Government of the Church to be Episcopacy, is one great means by which the Pious and Learned Divines of our Church (if this Gent. will give me leave to call 'em so) have clearly evinced and discovered the Innovations and Corruptions imposed by the Church of Rome on all in her Communion, to be fictitious and no way agreeing with the practice of the Primitive Church.

Now it upon the Authority of the Primitive Fathers and Councils, Obedience was universally given to acknowledge and receive the New Testament as the Word of God; and the Lords day celebrated as if commanded by Divine Precept, which is infallibly true; Is it reasonable now, to dispute their Writings and Decrees, their practice and usage, concerning the nature of the Government of the Church, which they were fully assured was established by the Apostles themselves?

And now I return to wait upon this unknown Gentleman. In his 2. p. he says, *Some have fancied the severe Execution of Penal Laws, by Fines, Imprisonment, Exile, &c. would have put an end to that Separation, &c. but Experience hath convinced them of a quite contrary effect.*

This Gent. will carry all before him if credited; I could certainly procure a Certificate under some hundreds of Hands of very Honest and Good men in *Chester*, that the **Penal Laws** when executed there, had brought all the Presbyterians, except a very small inconsiderable number to Conformity; ay, and one of the oldest and stoutest of them, acknowledged to the Rector of the Parish he liv'd in, that he, viz. the Rector had so thoroughly satisfied him, that he did not partake at the Eucharist out of fear of the **Law**, but for the satisfaction of his Conscience, and that he would continue to do so; but no sooner came the Indulgence out, but this old Puritan, and pretended Convert, set the Church at defiance, and with many more of that Tribe returned to their *Separation*; and thus it was said to be in most part of *England*; it's certain, that had not that Indulgence come out in *King Charles* the Second's time, which was procured by the Duke of *York* for some special Service designed by him for the *Romish Church*, there had been but a few in Conventicles, except Anabaptists and Quakers, who are incorrigible and above all others hardened, almost beyond hope; and yet this Gent. so confidently affirms, that the *Penal Laws* by experience had a quite contrary Effect, which is much more bold than true. In his 2 pag. he says further, *Others have persuaded themselves when ever such enforcements were laid aiae, the controverted Ceremonies would of course fall into Contempt, for being (by acknowledgement) things purely indifferent, &c. without any native worth or strength, they cannot be rationally supposed to stand any longer than they had those external props to bear them up;*
And

And'erein they have not been altogether disappointed, for they hear of five or six of the Clergy, and those not of the meanest sort, that have chosen to quit their preferments for the ease of their Consciences, &c.

To the *persuasion* which (he says) *some had*, I shall again oppose matter of Fact; the dreadful times of *Usurpation* which lasted more than Twelve years, all which time those *safer means were laid aside*, and the external props were taken away; and yet even then, the far greater number of the best people of *England*, did persevere in their Affection and Communion with the Church of *England*, manure the great care taken by the then Rulers; the Ordinances of Parliament (as then call'd) required, that no person should have a Common-prayer Book found in Custody, upon pain of being Indicted and *Fined* at the pleasure of the then Judges, who were their implacable Enemies (here the *Enforcements* were thought necessary on the other side) and the vast numbers of these who retain'd Communion with the Church, (notwithstanding the Enforcements to the contrary) appear'd with hearts full of Joy and Gratitude upon the Restoration.

As for the *Five or Six of the Clergy*, who he says are gone from us and are *none of the meanest*; I know not who he means; had they been Eminent men we should have heard of'em; this is trifling, or I can tell him of Dr. Dillingham Vice Chancellor, Dr. Connant Rector of Exeter Colledge, Vice Chancellor and Regis Professor of Divinity, and many more (tho' he perhaps is ashamed to name our Deserters) of th'other party, who Conform'd notwithstanding the Indulgence.

In p. 3. he saith, *That since neither Dissuting nor Penal Laws have hitherto brought English Protestants to an exact Uniformity, it is worth every honest mans Enquiry how under these different Modes of Worship, all men may be induced to live quiet and peaceable lives, &c.*

The Apostles Rule is, 1 Cor. 1. 10. *Now I beseech you Brethren, in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ, that ye all speak the same things, and that there be no Divisions among you: different Modes of Worship are here forbidden, and an exact Uniformity in the Church of Corinth requir'd, and I hope that this Gent. will not deny that this Rule is in force in the Church of England; and if this Gent. would press this Doctrin, he needs not pezzle men with any farther Enquiry how they may be induc'd to live quiet and peaceable lives. And I presume here to tell him, that against such who will not live quiet and peaceable lives, there are Penal Laws still in force. And this answers his next Paragraph, where he gives his Brother Mr. H-ry high Encomiums for his very modest and ingenious attempt, in his Book of the Nature of Schism, notwithstanding which, it doth appear that the Wars and Fightings irritated by them against the Church proceed from their Lusts, which*

would

would be at an end, where they entirely subject to Reason and Virtue, as the Gospel requires.

In p. 4. this Gent. would induce us to believe, that he is well skill'd in some strange Art, for he says, that I am a *furious Zealot and a Debauchee*, and that he knows by the *Complexion of my Book*. This Gent. may take the Liberty to censure me for a *furious Zealot*, because I have in my former paper affirm'd the Dissenters in England to be Schismatics; I do with the poor Publican cry, *God be merciful to me a Sinner*; but there's not an *jota* in that paper wick in the least tends to Debauchery. In p. 5. he's very angry that I give the Titles of *Pious and Learned* to our Episcopal Clergy, &c. and he says, that I call the *Dissenters Fools and Schismatics*, and is at a great Expence of Rhetoric upon me for these.

I cannot mention our Episcopal Clergy without Reverence; they are the *Stewards of the manifold Mysteries of God, and Ministers of Reconciliation*; and tho' my calling them by those Titles contributes not a mite to their worth, yet it was my duty to give the Titles due to them, especially in a paper Intended to Publish. I said (indeed) the Folly and Schism of our Dissenters has been clearly evinced, &c. It is an ordinary way in speaking, to joyn the word Folly with a Crime, and so by Folly and Schism I intended no more than the Folly of Schism, one act of Folly denominates not a Fool; but if this Gent. will misconstrue and pervert my Words, and thereby proclaim himself and his fellow Dissenters *Fools* as well as *Schismatics* it is out of my Power to help; indeed these are not worth a mans notice, only to shew, that this Gentlemans temper is too peevish for the Gospel, who at such little things so causlessly takes an occasion to cavil.

The next thing he quarels at, is in p. 6. That *I muster against them the great names of Hooker, Bramhal, Sanderfon, and diverse others, and wonders why Parker, Dryden, and L'Strange with their Learned and Elaborate Writings should not come in for a share of honor with them.*

Sir, *Hooker* and the others I named; for Piety and Learning are honor'd all the world over, and your detraction and all the Art you have, cannot lessen 'em. But Sr. as for *Parker, Dryden, and L'Strange*, who you named to *share with them in that Honor*, there can be no reason; They stand fairest for your Kalendar; I had been a Criminal should I have robb'd you of 'em, for they joyned hands with you in your Addresses to King James the 2d. to Congratulate and Applaud his Excellent Government, in granting *Liberty of Conscience*; and they readily consented with you to the taking off the *Penal Laws and Test*, and in allowing the *Dispensing Power*.

Here I think a proper place to answer what you say, in the beginning of
 your

your 6. p. where you instance some words of mine, and say, *They have been decantat Terms, to do the work of a common Foe, in ruining those that were more early aware of the advances of Popish Designs then some of their Neighbors, &c.*

|| *Witness
your Ad-
dresses.*

Sr. by this word *Neighbors*. I apprehend (and that truly) that you mean they of the Church of *England*. Why! they were the men who in time of extremity and danger, opposed the *advances of Popery*, and with Sincerity and Courage stood in the Gap; and this they did in two respects, First by refusing to take off the **Penal Laws** and the **Test**, and disowning the **Dispensing Power**. *The Penal Laws*, which by God's good Providence, were raised as a Fence to preserve us from Popery being about to be laid waste, and **Liberty of Conscience** without exception already granted, (an || Artifice by which most, if not all your Party were gull'd and cheated into a compliance with the times) The Arch-bishop of *Canterbury*, with six more Bishops, induced from a deep sense they had of a Design then visible, to bring in Popery, from a holy Zeal, and a deep sense they had of their Duty, to preserve the Church from the sad effects of that Design, presented their Petition to the King, declaring their readiness to have tender Conscience considered, so it might be done in a Parliamentary way; but for their Non-compliance with the **Dispensing power**, and those other things, wherein you so readily comply'd, by which you very much *promoted the advances of Popery*; they were all made Prisoners in the Tower, which suffering of theirs, God blessed with a very happy event. And Secondly they of the Church of *England* put a stop to the *advances of Popery*, by their Industrious and Learned Writings against Papists; a Popish Pamphlet from the *Savoy* or *Wild-house*, in those days could scarce be driv. but some or other Learned Divine of our Church, stopt its Carrier with such answers as silenced and shamed them; strengthened the weak and staggering, recalled many, and gave joy and satisfaction to all the Members of the Church in General.

My Author says in p. 6. *But if we thought fit to imitate his Pedantry, (meaning my naming Hooker, &c.) we could tell him of Reynals, Cartwright, Blundel, Ames, Daille, Owen, Baxter, &c. (ay, and John a Leyden too)*

This Gent. condemns me of *Pedantry*, yet his Gravity imitates me in the next breath even in that. The first he names, is *Reynalds*, he (alass) was sensible of their Schism, shook hands with 'em and dyed an eminent member of our Church. *Cartwright* was contemporary with Mr. Hooker, and let all Sober minded men Judge if the Ecclesiastical Politie Writ by Mr. *Hooker*, has not out-weighed by far, not only *Cartwright*, but all other

Disfemers

Dissenters who have written any thing of the Rites and Ceremonies and Government of the Church; So has Dr. Hammond, Dr. Stillingfleet and many others against Owen, Baxter and the rest of that Gang. I must beg his pardon that I can have no good opinion of || such who have spent their time and study to break the Order, Peace and Unity of the Church.

|| Owen
and
Baxter.

His first Paragraph contains the whole Controversy; I therefore thought it necessary to give that a full answer: So I have endeavoured to all his reflections that follow'd hitherto, but all he says to the remainder of my Preface, is either such mere Droll or Cavil and so foreign to the Controversy, that it is not worth paper to answer: I therefore now consider what he says to my Answer.

In his 9th pa. He says, I blame Mr H-ry for not choosing the true Standard whereby to discover Schism; He says Mr. H-ry chose no other but the Sacred Scripture, which being the great Law for the Government of men, and must certainly be the truest Touch-stone of Sin and Duty, &c. He says further; this is a hopeful beginning of Controversy to decline the Sufficiency and Propriety of Scripture as the Standard of good or evil. But will this man assigne a better? Yes (the IXth Article of the Apostles Creed, **I Believe the Holy Catholic Church, the Communion of Saints**) &c. and concludes, a happy Owen, when the first Paragraph contains a plain affront both to Scripture and common Sense.

Sr. the holy Scriptures is the great Law for the Government of men, and is certainly the truest Touch-stone of Sin and Duty. But Sr. whoever he be, that expounds Holy Scripture in contradiction or not consonant to an Article of Faith, his exposition cannot be true, and I am assured so, by that Article of Faith it contradicts or agrees not with. As for example; the Socinians have with so much cunning and plausibility expounded even those texts of Scripture which are express for the Divinity of our Blessed Savior, in favour of their Heresy, that they have stagger'd and perverted many persons of considerable understanding; but when the Article of Faith is consider'd, viz. *Scripture ought not to be Interpreted contrary to an Article of Faith.* And I Believe in one Lord Jesus Christ the only begotten Son of God &c. God of God, very God of very God, being of one Substance with the Father, &c. every Christian is infallibly assured that the Exposition of the Sacred Scripture made by the Socinians are false, because it is in contradiction to an Article of Faith. So when I saw Mr. H-ry had expounded the holy Apostles Precept *I beseech you Brethren* &c. 1 Cor. 1. 10. *that there be no Divisions among you* &c. and other Texts of Scripture, in favor of your Separat Communion to acquit that from the guilt of Schism, I was firmly assured that his Expositions were false, because they clash'd and agreed not with that IXth Article of Faith **I Believe the Holy Catholic Church the Communion**

of **Saints**; a Separate Communion being altogether inconsistent with that Article of Faith; I therefore recommended that Article of Faith as a better and more easy way for him to find out the true nature of Schism, than his so unskillful expounding Scripture, which the Apostle saith *2 Pet. 1 20 is not of any Private Interpretation*. Sr. I know not who, nor what you are, but I must tell you, that to affirm that an Article of Faith is a *plain affront to Scripture* is the nearest to the language of an Heretic that I have met with.

In p. 10 he saith, I offer to their Consideration, the Origination or first Existence of the Catholic Church, and that I said it was before the day of Pentecost; but he says, *how long before that day* I tell 'em not, and then he takes an occasion to let us know that he has read of the *Babylonish Captivity*.

I did set down the Text, *Acts 1. 15. The number of the Names together were about an hundred and twenty*, which was sufficient to denote the time, and he owns that he knows my meaning; but to exercise his abundant wit, he says, *here is a Discovery worthy of his Author*; no body can think that I mention'd it as the Discoverer, but as necessarily previous to what follow'd. But (he says) *had God no Church then among the Jews? must they be Excommunicated too? for what cause pray?* (and then reproachfully answers) *Not for want of Ceremonies, or a Pontiff I hope*. Then he says, *the man told us in his Preface, the Angels in Heaven were the most Glorious Members of the Church. How must we lay these things together? Were the Angels Originated at the day of Pentecost? Had they their first Existence then? Or did the Members of the Body Exist before the Body? Let the Citizen, or any other of his Cabala solve these Riddles, and he shall be my great Apollo*.

Church

That God had a Church from the beginning of the World, that the *Angels in Heaven* were from their Existence Members of it, being Created for that end; and that the Church of the *Jews* was Gods peculiar Church, are before the all infallibly true; but untill the Promise was fulfilled. *Desire of me, and day of I shall give thee the heathen for thine Inheritance, and the utmost parts of the Earth for thy Possession: Untill the middle Wall of the Partition was broken* *Psal. 2. down* (which was not 'til the Church was changed from Judaism to Christianity) the Title **Catholic**, was never, nor could properly be attributed to the Church; now unless this Gent. will shew, that the Church was call'd Catholic before the Day of Pentecost I mentioned, all these Riddles and Philosophical questions are of no more worth and value, than his great promise to make me his great Apollo.

Eph. 2.

14.

In p. 11. he questions not, that the Apostles and Disciples were the Church nor the power Christ gave the Apostles to Preach the Gospel to all the World; and says that I will observe Christ's Commission and Charge, that in every Nation they that believed might be Baptiz'd and made Members of the Church?

(but

(but says he) *how well they have observed their Commission who refuse to admit of Church Members upon their profession of Faith, unless they will also comply with some significant Rites of their own, that are alien to Scripture Rules, &c.* and then in his 12 p. he says, *its plain from this mans Confession, that to be a Disciple or Believer, would make a man a Member of the Church in Apostolical times, &c.*

It is true that *Faith* is the necessary Qualification of a mans admission to *Members* Baptism, and that persons are thereby made visible Members of the Church, *of the* but this is but the Initiation or beginning of Christianity; Obedience to Spi- *Church* ritual Rulers and Governors, being in this always suppos'd and imply'd; to ob- *to* *Faith* and Baptism must be added a strict Observation of the Order, *serve the* Peace and Unity of that holy Society into which they are admitted by those *Peace &* Qualifications above mention'd; and this is most strictly enjoy'd by the *Unity in* Holy Jesus, the Prince of Peace, and God of Order in the words mentioned *the* in the beginning of this paper, and divers other Texts in Scripture. As for *Church.* calling them *Rites and Ceremonies of their own, that are alien to Scripture Rules,* what ever tends to Order and the Beauty of Uniformity in the Church, is in the Power and Wisdom of the Apostles Successors, the Bishops, to impose, tho' not express'd in Scripture; there are no express terms in Scripture for Infant Baptism, nor for Women to partake at the Eucharist, yet allowed and required by the Authority of the Church, and submitted unto from the Primitive times by all Christians, except Anabaptists, who deny the former. And this fully answers his following Paragraph, which he closeth with much bitterness and venom against our Clergy, and serves only to shew what Spirit he is of.

In p. 13. he saith, *But though the Apostles did propagate the Gospel far and wide, yet that they did actually preach it to all Nations, is a thing we never heard of before T. W. told us so; and we must have better Evidence before we believe it.*

This is a mere Cavil, but he thinks he has sufficiently shewed my nakedness; I did not use the word *Actually*: I said that according to our Saviors Command the Apostles did Preach the Gospel to all Nations; I could tell him out of very good Authoritys, the vast Countrys in the Roman Empire in which St. Paul did *actually preach the Gospel* and that St. James did so in the Regions of *Palestine*; St. Mark in *Alexandria*, and the Countries far about it, St. John in *Asia*, St. Andrew in *Achaja*, St. Thomas in *India* and of the other Apostles *Propagating the Gospel* in other Countrys, ay, and Ordained Bishops and Presbyters in 'em too; But the Scripture saith, *There were dwelling at Jerusalem Jews, devout men out of every Nation under Heaven; to these the Apostles preached the Gospel, so in this respect, what I* *The Gos- pel preached to all Nations.* *Acts 2 5.* *said*

said is true; I had no great reason to fear that I had committed an unpardonable Crime; and if upon the Evidence given in Scripture he will not believe it he is at his liberty.

He goes on; *Whether the Seven Churches in Asia had Seven Bishops Presiding over them, neither more nor less is a thing that no way affects our present Controversy, nor can any thing be concluded from thence in favor of our English Prelacy; till the Power of these Bishops, the extent of their Diocesses, the Quality of their under Officers, &c. be proved the same with ours, viz. or liable to the same exceptions, &c. I understand not this last Sentence, or liable to the same exceptions, unless he would make the Primitive Church liable to the same exceptions.*

That *there were seven Bishops* is unquestionable, unless he will not give Credit to St. John's Testimony; that the *extent of their Diocesses* may in some measure be rightly estimated, it will be necessary to consider, what this *Asia* doth signify, which Dr. Hammond describes thus: "*Asia* here doth not signify the fourth part in the Division of the World, but in another Notion, known to Geographers; the *Lydian* or proconsular *Asia*," thus the word is used, *Acts* 19. 25. where St. Paul is said to persuade much People not only at *Ephesus*, but almost thro' all *Asia*; now in this *Asia*, as there were many Cities, so there were some Metropoles, Chief or Mother Cities, to each of which, the lesser adjacent were subordinate. Of this sort the first was *Ephesus*, saith *Vlpian*, l. *Observ. D. de Off. Procons.* Such again was *Thiatira*, saith *Ptolemy*, l. *Geog.* 1st. Cap. 2. Such was *Phyladelphia*, of the Province of the *Lydians*. Of the same Rank are *Laodicea*, *Sardis*, *Smyrna*, and *Pargamus*, affirmed by *Pliny* (*Nat. Hist.* l. 6. c. 29.) as Cities wherein the Roman Proconsuls residing, kept Courts for all the adjoining Cities to resort to; by which it appears that all the Seven Cities here named, were Metropoles, and accordingly under these Seven, all other Christian Churches were contained. And it is evident in *Ignatius's* time (which was not long after) that *Magnesia*, and *Trallys*, upon the Banks of *Meander*, (saith *Stephanus Bizantium*) being consequently included in this *Asia*, were Episcopal Churches, or Cities, *Damis* being Bishop of one and *Polybius* of the other, and so subordinate to the Metropolitan of *Ephesus*. After this the Doctor Translates out of *Eusebius*; part of which I here insert, (*viz.*) Who can recount the multitudes of Assemblies in every City? Who can describe the Confluxes to the Oratories, and the spacious Churches which they built from the foundations, not contenting themselves with the ancient Edifices? To these I will add but two more instances (*viz.*)

viz. *Jerusalem and Rome*: That the *Seven Churches in Asia*, and the Churches in *Jerusalem and Rome* had each of them but one Bishop, is the voice in the of all the Christian world, except the small number of your mistaken persuasion; and that each of these great and populous Cities contained very many Congregations nothing can be more evident; and further, that it was impossible that all the many Congregations in each City could be administered unto, by one Bishop without the assistance of Presbyters: And now lay all this together, and see if *in favor of our English Prelacy* every one is not forced to conclude, That the *Prelacy* or *Diocesan Bishops in England* is an exact parallel to the Churches above mentioned: *Primitive* & that nothing but *Obstinacy, Pride & Interest* can lead or hold my adversary and his Bretheren any longer in that fond and groundless Opinion of *Congregational or Parochial Episcopacy*.

As for the Power wherewith our Prelates are invested, it is from Heaven; the Son of God to whom all Power in Heaven and Earth was committed, *Episcopacy* first promised it to *St. Peter*, and *I will give thee the Keys of the Kingdom of pacy of Heaven*; afterwards he gave it actually to all the Apostles; *whoever sins ye remit they are remitted unto them, and whoever sins ye retain they are retained*: this is call'd the power of the Keys of binding and loosing; the power on and of Ordaining and Governing is given in these words; *as my Father sent me, perpetual even so I send you*. And that this Power was to continue by Succession until *Mat. 16*. the second coming of our Lord, is manifest in these words; *and lo I am with you always even to the end of the World*. And accordingly this Power *Joh. 20*. has descended by Succession from the Apostles to this present Age. Now *v. 23*. here is *Episcopacy both name and thing* (as you call it) according to the *Primitive Standard* proved, which you seem to desire; and now be not offended nor angry that you are (as you term it) *run down*, which is, that your Erronious Opinion, contrary to all Antiquity is so plainly discovered, not (as you say) by a bare word only, but by most firm and undeniable Testimony.

The under Officers you mention, are own'd to be no other than of Prudential Institution for dispatch of business, but are established by Law, to whom therefore your Obedience is due.

I wonder you mention your *Scotch Presbytery*; it can be for no other purpose than as a Rod shaken at us to beware of you, for they have sufficiently explained what is meant by *Comprehension*, to wit the expulsion of *Episcopacy*, and have assur'd us that our Bishops and Clergy, will meet with the same barbarous usage here, if ever it come into your Power.

In *v. 14*. he modestly says, *he will not take upon him to contradict those Learned men, who think the Angels* (mentioned in the Revel. by *St. John*) were

were Bishops; he having granted this, is all my desire, and therefore all his witty Animadversions which follow, are not worth my answering. It would be but needless Repetition to say any thing to his following Paragraph in his 14. p. having fully answered it before.

In his p. 15. he says, *What do I mean in saying in these Multiplied Churches there was no Variation;* and then very disingenuously changes my word, for a word very different in signification, and asks, *Was there no variety at all in any Circumstance of Worship?* and says, *the contrary may be prov'd even in the Apostles times,* and instances that which he calls a Scuffle, Acts 15. betwixt the believing Jews and Gentiles, about Jewish Ceremonies.

Here were no such different Circumstances as to divide their Communion, therein there was no Variation, their Unity was preserved; the Jewish Ceremonies, which the Converted Jews would have imposed on the Christian Gentiles were no Circumstances in the Christian Worship; the Council at Jerusalem thought therefore necessary to forbid those Impositions; now in this very Case the necessity of Apostolic Jurisdiction doth appear, that by a decisive and definitive Sentence of Ecclesiastical Authority, it may not be in the power of private Christians to impose their different Sentiments upon one another, and that there may be no Variation nor breach of Unity in the public Worship of God. So that this Instance is not at all for his purpose. He says if I mean, *there was no variation from Scripture Rules (tho we are afraid that will scarce hold, yet) we wish it had been so still.*

By Scripture Rules here, he certainly means the New Testament; if this Gent. had any regard to Ecclesiastical Antiquity, he would never have talked of Scripture (that is New Testament) Rules before they were written.

He says, *We have a Notion of Unity loved down (in my p. 2.) in which we freely concur with him;* these are my words (for he has not transcribed them fairly) They are all one with that Church first mentioned at Jerusalem, and (which he omits) all one with one another; being all United into one Spiritual Society or Body, under one Head Christ Jesus, &c. (and which he has omitted too) and are in all things the same with that first Church, United in one Baptism, and one Faith, and all partakers at the same Eucharist, &c.

That, (says he) is the same for substance, for in that they all agreed in the Primitive times, in the same Circumstances such a Unity we hold, and doubt not but in our Congregations this Unity may be found. And so he runs on in his 16. p. and endeavours to persuade all men (just like the Donatists) that these Dissenters are more truly Catholic than we.

That

That the *Power* delegated by our blessed Saviour to his Apostles was to be confer'd upon their Successors, is certainly implied in the promise, *Lo I am with you alway, even to the end of the world.* That the Church of England was Planted, either by some of the Apostles or some of their Successors and that the Succession of Bishops has continued in this Church from that first propagation; by as strong proofs as human Authority is capable of, *viz.* by Records and Histories may appear; and consequently that the Church of England is as truly an Apostolic and Catholic Church as Jerusalem, Alexandria, Antioch and those other Churches which were of the first Planting. Mat. 28.
20.
The Church of England truly Apostolical.

Her Orders then are to be equally obeyed, Her Unity and Peace as strictly maintained and whatsoever amounted to Schism in any of them must be so in her: your Uniting then in a Communion Separate from this Church, bears no similitude with Primitive Unity, being contrary to their Practice. And being that in your Congregations the Divine Authority is wanting, there can be no such Unity found among you, as Primitive Unity.

He Says the Eucharist was the same for Substance in the Primitive Congregations, and that they all agreed in the same Circumstances; It is very true, for no difference would be allow'd; Christians then, durst not entertain so wicked and uncharitable a thought, as that of setting up a Separate Congregation as you do; They devoted themselves to the Command of their master, *to have Peace one with another.* They for Conscience sake observ'd the Command of the Apostle, *Obey them that have the Rule over you;* If you would tread in their steps, you would as Religiously observe the Unity and Peace of the Established Church wherein you live in all Circumstances as they did. Mark 9.
50.
Heb. 13.
17.

All his next Paragraph Pa. 17. is the same, in different Phrases; He says, the description *I have given of Church Unity ruins my whole Book and Cause* (an hasty Sentence) for says he, *if this be the true proper Unity of Churches, then there may be true Church-Unity without the Uniting of many particular Churches, Ministers and People into one Diocesan Church under the Jurisdiction of a Prelate and his Officers &c.* Then he is not much against the conveniency of Parochial-Precincts, but says according to my Definition, it is not *De essentia Unitatis.*

It is plain, all that he drives at here is that there may be true Church Unity without Episcopacy, I have answer'd this before by shewing, that all Presbyters with their Particular Congregations, that is Ministers and People now resolved into Parochial Churches, within the Dioceses of the Respective Cities, were United under the Jurisdiction of the Respective Bishop of each City; So that the Uniting of many particular Churches, Ministers & People into

into one Diocesan Church, under the jurisdiction of a Prelate, is true Church Unity as used in Primitive times, by which it appears, that this Gent. Doctrine, viz. that there may be true Church Unity without Episcopacy, is a more
 1 Cor. 11. 16. Innovation, there being no such custom in the Churches of God as the Apostle speaks.

As for their Officers they have the Sanction of our Laws to Authorize them; an Authority far greater than can be shewed for Lay Elders; Officers subserviant to the Minister of every Congregation, and tho' generally ignorant, and many of them cannot write their Names, yet are made judges of their fellow Christians sufficiency in faith; a novelty created by Calvin, and how reasonable let the impartial judge. He says, *so a man may plead to the jurisdiction of a Diocesan Prelate, may step over Parish bounds, &c.*

Nm. 15. So did Korah and his Congregation against Moses and Aaron, their Controversie being the very same with yours against the Church; they were for leveling the Priest-hood, so are you; they were for setting up a new model'd Congregation, so are you; God shewed his displeasure against their Pride and Disobedience, by a most terrible destruction; and the Apostle saith, *Whatsoever things were written aforetimes, were written for our Learning.*

In the end of p. 17. and in 18. he lays to my charge, that I distinguished not betwixt the extraordinary power which was properly Apostolical, and that ordinary Pastoral Power which was eminently comprehended in the other.

The Authority and Government of the Church must have expired with the Apostles, had not this Power been conveyed by their Delegation to their Successors, by virtue whereof the ordinary Pastoral power, viz. Power to Preach the Gospel, Administer Sacraments, Absolve Penitents, &c. was and is confer'd upon the Presbyters: the extraordinary and Apostolic Power of Ordaining and Governing, of Binding and Loosing, being intirely reserved in the Bishops the Apostles Successors; and this too, of the ordinary Pastoral power is (to use his own words) eminently comprehended in the Diocesan Bishops, as it was in the Apostles. Other distinction than this, cannot be truly made as I suppose. Then he maliciously mentions the Arch-bishop of Canterbury; what Christian temper or good manners he shews therein, let the Reader judge: For it is written, Thou shalt not speak evil of the Ruler of thy People. The Nature and Extent of the Episcopal Office being fully stated, answers what he saith in the bottom of his 18 p. He says, Dr. Hammond tells us that all the Elders we read of in the Scripture, were Bishops, and that every particular Church had one of these.

This Gent. has this quality, he never mentions the place where the thing may be found in any Author he quotes, which is not fair. Dr.

Ham-

Hammond
 " cello
 of the
 Elder
 tions,
 where
 ments
 in Scr
 the wo
 clude
 grega
 P.
 Titus
 beside
 W
 it wa
 was l
 ent.
 in th
 T
 succ
 livin
 ther
 of P
 ing
 way
 tou
 I
 Ti
 po
 fer
 Ti
 to
 wa
 w
 tu
 ca
 w
 a

Hammond says indeed ; " That the Bishops in every City were the Successors of the Apostles. In his *Anot. on Acts c. 11. b.* and in his *Tracts Dissert. 3* of the Power of the Keys ; *Asian* Bishops called Angels ; and Bishop and Elder terms equivalent, (which were written in Vindication of his Dissertations, from the exceptions of the Assembly of Divines (as they were called) wherein he has, by Scripture, the Primitive Fathers and undeniable Arguments evinced (to the silencing of the Assemblers) that the word Bishop in Scripture did always signify a Prelate or a Diocesan Bishop ; and that the word Elder had the same signification ; so that if this Gent. will be concluded by the Author he has cited, his pretensions to Parochial and Congregational Bishops are at an end. 6. 3.

P. 19. he says, *tis pritty to hear him say, these two (that is Timothy and Titus) were ordained Bishops by the Apostles ; was there any Apostle concerned besides Paul in it ? Here lies the trick, &c.*

Whether they were Ordained by St. Paul alone, or with others conjunct, it was all one, being I was only to prove, that their being Ordained Bishops was by Apostolic power, which being done tho' by St. Paul alone is sufficient. Nothing but prejudice and ill nature could see any thing of a Trick in this.

Then he puts the Question ; *and how (pray) could Timothy and Titus succeed the Apostles in the See of Ephesus and Crete, whilst the Apostles were living ?* And then he is pleased in his 25 p. to Droll and scoff at 'em, and then says, *to be the Apostles Successors, the Apostles yet alive, and in plenitude of Power is a very great Mystery*, (so is all the Gospel) then he closes, making himself merry with the ignorance of a Vicar of Newport (who, by the way is said to have been a Nonconformist) which in a matter so momentous, carries too much levity for a Minister of the Gospel.

I said in my p. 3. this Apostolical Succession was begun in *Timothy and Titus, &c.* They could not have been said to be Successors of Apostolical power, if the Apostle moved by the Holy Ghost had not whilst living, conferred it on them ; could the Apostle have Ordained them after he was dead ? The Apostle by Ordaining them in his life time, secured the Succession to them, and the Government too in the Apostles absence, even whilst he was living ; so that it was not improperly said, that this Apostolic power was begun in *Timothy and Titus*, they being the first mentioned in Scripture, who were invested with Episcopal power of Jurisdiction, by Apostolical Ordination ; that this Succession of Bishops is (as he scoffingly calls it) a very great Mystery is very true, the Bishops being by virtue of this Succession, as truly the Representatives of Christ Jesus, as Ambassadors are of Kings.

In p. 20. he says I affirmed that no Presbyters had power to Ordain,

1 Tim.

4. 14.

He desires me to try, *how I will reconcile this with Dr. Hammond, who says these Presbyters were all Bishops; or with Scripture it self, that says even Timothy received the Gift, by the laying on the Hands of the Presbiterary.*

Mere Presbyters assumed power to Ordain, first found in the Church of Rome.

I have try'd, and find it easily reconciled with Dr. Hammond, for his Judgment is, that those Presbyters who joyn'd in that Ordination were Apostles, which you may see in his Paraphrase on the above-mentioned Scripture, and he refers to Note on *Acts chap. 11. f.* for his reasons. The first clear Instance of mere Presbyters assuming the power to Ordain, is to be found in the Church of Rome, as the learned Primate *Bramhal* tells us, p. 164. and in p. 431. he saith, "We may justly ascribe the *reviving* of the Arian Heresy to the Dispensations of the Court of Rome, who Licensed Ordinary Priests to Ordain and Confirm, &c.

In p. 20. he further saith, *for propagation of Apostolical Succession, &c. I inform 'em, that Linus by Apostolical Consecration Succeeded the Apostles in the See of Rome; here is a double blunder again, Linus succeeded whilst the Apostles were alive. How else could he have Apostolical Consecration, &c.*

The best way to determin this, is to observe the Rule which in great Wisdom our Law hath appointed for Jurors, to bring in their Verdict according to their best Evidence: The best Evidence in this Case, are the writings of the Fathers who lived in the next Age, among whom, *Irenaeus* is accounted the most exact Notary of the Succession of Bishops to the Apostolic Sees; he affirms, that "Linus was made Bishop by the Apostles, and that he Succeeded St. Peter in the See of Rome, and that next after him "Cletus (by some called *Anen Cletus*) Succeeded in that See: and with him "Epiphanius agrees; and with these diverse others; now this is so far from being a blunder, that it is a clear Manifestation of the great care the Apostles had of providing for the Succession in their life time, which no man can object against, much less profanely Ridicule (as my Adversary does) who will consider that otherwise the Succession must have failed, and been extinct if neglected whilst the Apostles lived.

In the 21 p. at the bottom, he saith, That my affirming, that this line of Apostolic Succession of Bishops, hath continued in all Ages to this present time; is (saith he) an assertion without the least shadow of proof; yea contra.

Succession ry to the acknowledgement of all Church Historians.

of Bishops from the Apostles without interruption to this Age.

It this Gent. had mentioned where any Church Historian of Credit, is of his Opinion, and shewed when any interruption happened, he had done something for the support of his opinion. But let him examine from this present age, to the days of *Lucius King of the Northumbers*, (who is credibly said to be the first King that Embraced the Christian Faith in this Isle) and if he can assign one Breach of this Succession, he out does his predecess-

fors

fors, but if not, he stands guilty of bringing a false Accusation against all truly Catholic Churches. For not only the Church of England, but all other Established Catholic Churches do assert the Succession of their Bishops, to descend from the Apostles: And it is in every Diocess as sacredly Recorded as the Succession of Kings and Emperors to their Thrones.

But in p. 22, he says, *The very Papists themselves, confess that there are insuperable difficulties about the Succession of Popes in the Roman See.* My Adversary would retake such boldness in me; I never discoursed with any of that Church who did not zealously affirm the Succession; and I believe they may challenge him to name any of them, or shew any Books of theirs, wherein he can find such a **Confession** as he alledgeth. In the days of *Valentinian*, there was great strife about the Claim of that See; yet none was put into possession who had not Episcopal Consecration, in which respect the Episcopal Succession was preserved; so that the *insuperable difficulties*, are but his bare Allegation.

But pray how can there be a Priest without *this Line of Apostolic Succession*? Can a man receive Priestly, *i. e.* Spiritual Power, by laying on of the hands of them who have not Power to confer it; it is *St. Paul's* question, *Rom. 10. 14, 15. how shall they hear without a Preacher, and how shall they Preach except they be sent*, &c. which is a strong affirmation, that no man ought to preach without Divine Mission. The great Bishop of our Souls was sent of God, the Apostles received their Mission from him, and no man can say he is sent, (that is) can truly be a Minister of the Gospel, who hath not Apostolical Mission, and no man hath power to send, who hath not received it by Succession from the Apostles: and this Succession must be by an uninterrupted Line from the Apostles, or it ceases to be Divine; so that the absolute necessity of an uninterrupted Line is a sufficient reason to prove it. And now I may affirm, that great Catholic truth (it remaining firm and unshaken) set down in my former paper, p. 3. (*viz.*) who ever he be that is out of this Line of Apostolic Succession, and Exercises any Ministerial Office, without the Commission of Episcopal Ordination, can be no more or other, then a Lay Impostor and a Schismatic, and that without exposing Christianity it self (as he says p. 23. I do) or without leaving the Consciences of all the men in the World, at an utter uncertainty; whether they have a true Ministry. or true Ordinances or no; for there is no other way wherein a true Ministry and consequently true Ordinances can be found, and this is so far from Leaving mens Consciences at an uncertainty, that it is the only foundation of certainty and assurance of a true Ministry, and consequently true Ordinances, and from whence we receive real comfort in the Participation;
for

for other Foundation, saith Saint Paul, can no man lay, than that is already lay'd, which is Jesus Christ; (1 Corinthians, 3. vers. 11.) Jesus Christ hath founded his Church upon the Holy Apostles, and so as not to be demolished, or expire with their lives, but to continue firm in their Successors to the end of the World; to deny this is both to distrust the power and providence of God, and to make void the promise of our Lord, made, *Mat. 28. 20.*

But this my Adversary does; for (says he in p. 24.) *in how many Cases may this Line be broken, and all the Apostolic power conveyed there, be spilt and lost, &c.* Is not this mans Faith too weak in the power of God, and in the promise of his Son? Which is, *that the Gates of Hell shall not prevail against her, Mat. 16. 18.* that is his Church; and shall the devices of men out do the Gates of Hell? shall the fancy of this man and his Brethren over-throw that against which, God hath promised the powers of Hell shall not prevail? And because these men infatuated by Error, despise this Church, whose Foundation was laid by the blessed Jesus, and hath the power of the Keys of the Kingdom of Heaven committed to her, must she be made a Prey and a Sacrifice to the blind Ignorance, Pride and Lusts of these mens minds, to make way for the Whimsy and Invention of man; not known or heard of in the Church of Fourteen hundred years? Must the power of Preaching the Gospel, Absolving Penitents, Consecrating the Holy Sacraments, &c. be lost and made void by being translated into prophane hands, to be Officiated by those who are not sent of God? All which, are the unavoidable consequences of this man's Doctrine. For he says p. 24. *Where this Line is broken all this Apostolic power is spilt and lost.*

The Abbot of Hy was objected by a Popish Writer to prove our Church Schismatical, and it is now brought by this Dissenter against the *Apostolic Succession*, which in his p. 25. he names in the Margin. The most Reverend Primate Bramhall, in answer to the Papist, writes a just Vindication of the Church of England, &c. In p. 131, and 135, of his works, you have an account at large, where he clears the Northumbrian Bishops from *Receiving Consecration of the Abbot of Hy*, and shews, that they had their Consecration from the Bishop of Derry, (then called Derry-magh) under whose Visitation this Abbot lived: The Primate tells us, the Records were to be seen at Derry before the Irish Rebellion; and this story you have much to the same purpose, in the Lord Bishop of St. Asaph's *Historical account of Church Government*, &c. Chap. 5. so that this Dissenter has no more advantage with the Popish Writer against our Church, by casting this Imputation out of this Story, to break the *Succession*, than the Papist had to prove us Schismaticks; nor is any *intercession* hereby proved which my Adversary pretends.

In

In the same p. 25. he desires to know of me, or any who encourages me to write little Books, *Whether this Line of Succession may be continued in a Schismatical Church, and the Apostolical Power conveyed thereby?* (says he) *if by Schism men and Societies are cut off from the Universal Church, then such Schismatical Churches are no Churches, &c.*

What occasion I gave him for this question, you may see in my 3d. Page; after I affirmed the Apostolical Succession of Bishops, and inferred from thence, that who ever Exercised any Ministerial Office out of this *Line of Succession*, and had not Episcopal Ordination, could be no other than a Lay Impositor and a Schismatic; then I inferred further, and consequently all Societies of Christians who with-draw themselves from the Government of their Bishops; who are the Apostles Successors, and from Communicating with those Presbyters lawfully set over them by Episcopal Ordination and Institution: and frame themselves into any other sort of Government, are guilty of Schism; such Societies are Schismatics, and cut themselves off from the Catholic Church, but can in no sort properly be call'd Churches, and therefore I understand not his Logic in this, (viz.) *If by Schism, Men and Societies are cut off from the Universal Church, therefore Schismatical Churches are no Churches.* || Churches they are, tho' Schismatical; whilst they retain the Apostolical Succession, they retain also the power and Authority of Ordination, Preaching the Gospel, and Administering the Sacraments, and so retain the name of a Church. * But what are our Dissenters concerned herein? They disclaim the Succession, and deny any power or Virtue to be derived from it, and therefore have no Commission to preach the Gospel, or Administer Sacraments, &c. and consequently no right to the name of a Church; but by the word Societies they would have Churches understood, that thereby their Unlawful Assemblies might pass under that Title.

I must here put one question to these Dissenters; many of the Clergy of the Romish Church have embraced Communion with the Reformed Churches; I desire to know whether Re-ordination in this case was ever required? the answer must be in the Negative, their Ordination being derived from the Apostles Successors; in vain then is this Gentleman's attempt to Un-church the Church of England (as in his p. 25.) for that our Bishops have derived their Consecration from the Church of Rome, it being the Judgement of all Reformed Divines, that formal Schism cannot invalidate the power of Regular and formal Ordination.

In p. 26. he says *I would Exclude all the Reformed Churches beyond Sea that have not those Governors, &c.* by those Governors, I suppose he means Diocesan Bishops.

To this I answer; That many very Learned and Pious persons among them, have declared their longing desires for the Episcopacy, but living in Popish Dominions, cannot have any but those of the Romish Communion. Others there be, that approve of it, yet live in Republic Governments, and they will by no means admit of Episcopacy in that Regiment; invincible necessity is upon these, and therefore in Charity cannot be charged with Schism, being in their desires Catholic; but as for those who with you, and your Brethren in *England*, deny its Authority, and obstinately refuse Subjection to it, they with you are notorious Schismatics, and can in no wise be excused.

As for that fanciful supposition of a *Company of Christians cast upon a remote Island* (which he talks of in p. 26.) or if all the Pastors in a Country should be put to death, &c. He cannot bring one instance of either, and if it should so happen, all the Lay-men and mere Presbyters in the World cannot make one Evangelical Priest; cannot impower them to Preach the Gospel, nor Consecrate Sacraments, &c. but what can be expected from Invincible necessity? They have a God to pray to, whose mercies are infinite, *who will fulfil the desires of them that fear him, and will hear their cry*, Psal. 114. v. 19.

In his 27 p. he saith, *But if we assent to the Whimsie of a constant Succession, as if power were conveyed like water in a Conduit, after a Physical manner, by contact passing through the Fingers ends of the Prelate, into the noddle of the person Ordain'd, &c.*

A *Whimsie* I take it, signifies some Phantastic Device, or the Creature of an unstable, or unsettled brain; which being applyed or imputed to Prelates, who bear the Authority of Christ, deriving it Originally from him, can be no less (I think) than Blasphemy, for our blessed Savior saith to his Apostles, and in them to their Successors; *He that despiseth you, despiseth me, and he that despiseth me, despiseth him that sent me*; Luke 18. v. 16. no man that has not arrived to the highth of wickedness, and given himself over to a reprobate mind, would thus revile the Ambassadors of God; he can be no better than a filthy Dreamer, who thus despiseth Dominion, and speaks evil of Dignities. Jude, v. 8. How wantonly does this man sport himself in holy things? and by vilifying and contemning the Evangelical holy Priesthood make void, and a kishaw (as much as in him lyeth) of our holy Religion, exposing and prostituting it to the contempt and scorn of Infidels and Atheists.

What he mentions in p. 28. viz. *The Lead Extravagant Caresses that have happened between the ambitious Princes, and aspiring Church-men* concerns us not, for he cannot name any such aspiring Church-men that have
been

been in England since the Reformation, and tho' he could, the order being of Divine Institution cannot be dissolved for any mans miscarriage; if by this he means any thing of the Church of Rome, we abjure her Jurisdiction over us. Dr. Sancroft Arch-bishop of Canterbury, with six other Bishops, in their Address to K. James, declared against the *Usurping of any absolute Empire, over the Civil and Religious Rights of men*, and this was done so publickly, that it is more than probable, the same of it is gone thro' the World, so that this Insinuation of his, is a mere malicious calumny.

In my p. 4. I proved that to love as Christians in Scripture sence, is to love as members of Christ, and that this obliges Christians to preserve the Body (i. e. the Church) from Rents and Schisms, which (says he) *we never deny*. He implicitly confesseth that they ought to preserve the Church from Rents and Schisms, and yet shamefully denies it in practice every day. I have so fully spoken of this before that I need say no more in this place.

And here again are the Ceremonies objected, which tho' I have proved to be no sufficient ground for their Separation, yet for further satisfaction I will here Recommend the Reasons given by the **Convocation**, why the Ceremonies were retained; They are affix'd before the Book of Common Prayer, and are important enough, to satisfy the Conscience of any sober Conscientious Christian.

In p. 29. he says, *for our further Conviction we are told* (the Communion of Saints is one External visible Communion in the Christian Church) *which is so far from explaining the thing, that it makes it much darker*; what I said above, had reference to the Christian Church when it was first called Catholic. And was not the Communion of the Church then *One*? and ought it not to be so still? and was not the *Union External and Visible*? but I did a little after explain by shewing wherein this Communion doth more particularly consist: In my p. 5. (*viz.*) in the same Articles of Faith; I nam'd the Apostles, *Nicene* and *Athanasian* Creeds, which have been received and used in the Catholic Church, from the times they were first published, and appoint'd by the Authority of the Church; the Creeds are Compendiums and brief Comprehensions of the Objects of our Christian Faith, and do contain all things necessary to be believ'd; every Article being a principle of the Christian Religion, which every Christian is bound to profess, and is the Test to distinguish between Heretics and sound Christians; and now this profession and agreement of Christians in these Articles of Faith, may be truly called the Communion of Saints in point of Faith. But my Adversary is not very fond of these Creeds; and *why not in Scripture* (says he) Why! every one who truly believes the Scripture, believes the Arti-

cles of Faith, and every one who believe the Articles believe the Scripture. He says, *They are but Human composition.* They were *Composed* by those to whom the Care and Authority of the Church was committed, and every Article for the benefit of all, even the meanest Christians, being formed and Collected out of Sacred Scripture, are of Divine Authority.

He says, *I shut out the Greek and other Eastern Churches.* This is but his own Conception, for they agree with us in all Articles of Faith; they do not indeed express the Article of the Holy Ghost in the very same words, but they acknowledge that the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father by the Son, which differs not in sense, and they Worship the Trinity in Unity, and Unity in Trinity, so that in Articles of Faith we and they hold Communion. Well! I perceive tho' my Adversary relishes not, and speaks with but indifferent Respect of the Creeds, yet he says, however *he is so far in Communion with us*, so in this, he will be no Schismatic; or rather no Heretic.

The Communion of Saints in the Eucharist.
1 Cor. 10.
21.
2. 16.
2. 17.

Another particular (which I mentioned) requir'd in this Communion, is partaking all at the same Table; (which tho' it be not *individually* yet Spiritually it is *the same*; and being every where called the Lords Table, could be no otherwise meant; but that this Gent. will be very witty, and take exceptions at every thing. The Apostle calls it the Lords Table. The Cup of Blessing which we bless, is it not the Communion of the Body of Christ? We being many, are one Bread and one Body, for we are all partakers of that one Bread. All true Christians partaking at the Lords Table are one Body in the Apostles Sense; the bread not only signifying the Body of Christ, but the Unity of the partakers also; and this is the Communion of Saints at the Lords Table. Here, says he, *we are with him still.* I wonder at his confidence; he would say sure, *here we ought to be with them*, for they are not with us. By comparing our Church with the Primitive Churches, I have proved her to be a Church truly Catholic; her Jurisdiction as truly Apostolical as they were; from whence it follows (as I have said) that her Orders are to be equally obey'd; her Unity and Peace as strictly maintained, and what soever was Schism in any of them must be so in her.

To refuse Communicating with any of them at the Lords Table, and to have set up another Table in opposition to any of them, must in this Gentlemans judgment have been criminous Schism; then of necessity it holds true against our Dissenters; they refuse Communion with that Church which most certainly holds true Communion with the Universal Catholic Church, and consequently with the Son of God, who is the Head thereof, and the Principle and proper Object of all Christian Communion: Our

Dissen-

Dissenters have set up a separate Table in opposition thereto, rob'd her of her Members, and broke her Unity; all this being notoriously the breach of Christian Charity, is in this *Gent.* and *Mr. Hry's* Sense too, Schism; which *Mr. Hry* calls an *Arch-Rebel*, (but not so properly) as an Infamous Rebellion in *Christ's Kingdom*; and thus they are Schismatics in Separating from the Communion of Saints at the Lords Table. What he talks here, of *deriving our Succession from the Church of Rome*, is already answered.

A third particular required in this Communion, I affirmed to be, the *Communion* of all in the same holy Prayers and Supplications, Intercessions and giving of thanks, according to *St. Paul's* express Command. *Saints in*

To this he says, *I cannot mean, that in those Dutys we must necessarily use the same the very same words, &c. for then I exclude all the World but them of my Prayers. own persuasion, and a great many of them too.*

I exhort therefore (saith St. Paul) that first of all, Supplications, Prayers, Intercessions, and giving of Thanks be made for all men; for Kings and all that are in Authority, &c. Here is a sufficient ground from Holy Scripture, for Liturgies, or Forms of Prayers in the public Worship and Service of God; and St. Paul gives his reason for it in his Ep. to the Romans; that we might with one mind and one mouth, Glorify God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ. v. 6.

According to this command, Forms of Prayers or Liturgies were composed early in the Catholic Churches, and have been used ever since, that there might be an Unity in their Supplications and Prayers, and in their Thanksgivings and Praises, that nothing should be omitted, nor any thing more in our Petitions express'd, but what our holy Religion requires, & that there should be no rudeness, or undecency in words (in which respects, conceived and Extempore prayers are very liable to be faulty) and in these, they were all obliged to join where ever they came together for the public Worship and Service of God: Herein they had Communion with God the Father, and with his Son Jesus Christ, who was in the midst of them, and in whose name they were presented, and with one another; Uniting all in the same Prayers; here is the Communion of Saints in holy Prayers. It is true, that the Respective Provincial or Diocesan Churches had not every one their set Forms of Prayers or Liturgies in the very same words; every Bishop having power to Compose a Form for that Church of which he was Over-seer: Yet they were the same for substance, so that every Christian was obliged to Communicate not only with the Bishop, or his Presbyters under whose Jurisdiction he lived, but all Catholics coming to remote Churches did, as bound by the Rules of Catholic Unity, Communicate with their Fellow-Christians to what Church soever they came.

That in this the Church of *England* (as in the former particulars) holds

*Pream
Quinto
& Sexto
Ed. 6ii.
cap. pri-
mi.*

Communion with the Primitive Catholic Church will appear, if we consider that the CONVOCATION in the Reign of *Edward the Sixth*, by whom our Liturgie was Reform'd; with one consent agreed upon one Set Form of Prayer, Administration of Sacraments &c. to be used in the *English* tongue in every Dioces thro' out the Realm; In the Reforming and Compofure wherof, they had before their eyes, the Word of God and the *Primitive Church* for their imitation: the Glory of God, the Comfort and Edification of the People for their End: and all their Supplications and Prayers therein, are directed to God Almighty, presented in the name of the blessed Jesus; and all we supplicate for in them, is for no other, than what is allow'd of, and required in our holy Religion, and is a reasonable Service.

To this I will add two things more; *viz.* Mr. *Calvin's* Letter to the then Protector of England, which is to this purpose. For so much as concerns the Prayers and Ecclesiastical Rites, I much approve that they be determined, so that it may not be Lawful for the Ministers in their Administrations to vary from it; and he gives his Reasons. That it may be a help to the weakness of some; That it may be a Testimony of the Churches Consent, and that it may stop the desultory levity of those who are for new things,

*Disp. of
Liturgy
Prop. 10* The other is what their Learned Mr. *Baxter* saith, *viz.* "The constant disuse of Forms, is apt to breed a giddiness in Religion, and may make men Hypocrites, who shall delude themselves with conceits, that they delight in God, when it is but in these Novelities and Variety of Expression that they are delighted, and therefore he adviseth Forms to fix Christians, and make them sound. Thus these two great Guides of theirs.

It being clear that there is a Communion of Saints in Prayers as in other Offices of Divine Worship; the refusing to Communicate therein, is a Breach of Unity, and of the Communion of Saints. Nor can I stand charged (as my Adversary affirms) with Excluding all those from the Communion of Saints who use not the Liturgy of our Church; every National Catholick Church having equal Authority to enjoin its own Liturgy, in which every Member therein is bound to Communicate by the very nature of Unity required in the Gospel.

*Revel. 5.
9. &c.* St. *John* declares, that the Four and Twenty Elders in his vision sung a new Song, and sets down the Form of words wherein the Angels, the Beasts, and the Elders, all with a loud Voice glorified the Lamb, &c. Now what ever

ever else this may signifie, it certainly Represents the Uniformity of Divine Service above ; and it is to be considered, that the Church on Earth is the Type of that glorious part of the Catholic Church Triumphant in Heaven ; and tho' the perfection of that Unity which is above, cannot be attained unto in this imperfect State which is below, yet that which is above is proposed for our imitation, and sheweth the great delight the Glorious Trinity the One God hath in the Unity, of his Service. The nearer we on Earth Resemble that Unity which is above, the more perfect we are. The Church of England, in Immitation of the Church above, enjoyns Unity in Her Prayers, Intercessions, &c. and in all the Worship and Service of God ; but in contradiction to this, our Dissenters can by no means endure it.

A Fourth particular (mentioned by me) required in the Communion of Saints, is ; To be Subject and Obedient to our Spiritual Rulers, and Governours (who have derived their Authority from the Apostles by a due Succession) in all things pertaining to Godly Life, Decency and Order. Communion of Saints in subjection to Govern-

To this he says in p. 31. and 32. *We are very desirous to give due Honour and Obedience to our Spiritual Governours, who derive their Authority from Christ, which is more proper than to speak of deriving it from the Apostles, for Christ is the only Fountain of Authority and the Streams are derived rather from the Fountain than the Cistern ; it is observable, the mans expression is sunk from an Uninterrupted Succession to a due Succession : To observe the Apostolical precepts in Government and Worship may make it up a due Succession, but there is more in an Uninterrupted one than so ; now before he can say we want this Qualification for Communion, he must prove that Diocesan Bishops are made our Spiritual Rulers by a Divine Command.* nors.

For any man living to affirm that he has Received Authority to be a Minister of the Gospel from Christ Jesus immediately, is contrary to the current of the Gospel and the voice of all Antiquity since the Apostles : Who but the Apostles can this be attributed unto ? St. Paul, tho' after the miraculous descent of the Holy Ghost upon the other Apostles, had indeed a Commission from Christ Jesus immediately, yet it was confer'd in an extraordinary manner, by a voice from Heaven that it might appear to be no cheat, (Acts 13. 3.) and he entred not upon his Office without the Imposition of the hands of the Church. No spiritual Power is received from Christ Jesus, by any man immediately ; it is conferred no other way, but

but from Christ to his Apostles, and by a Succession from them to our days, the Original and *Foundation thereof being Christ Jesus*. If any man will pretend to an immediate Authority, and prove it not by some Miracle or Revelation, he can pass for no other than a mere Enthusiast and an Impostor. This Doctrin of his, is the false bottom upon which many Heresies, strange and pernicious Opinions have been built, and is the Parent of our Schisms, and Separations; if a man by this Suggestion can but gull the weak people, into a belief of such a Commission to be immediately from Christ, How do they follow and admire him? With-draw their Obedience from their lawful Governors and Pastors, break the bonds of Charity, and all the Rules of Peace and Order? and all this only to be the Disciples of such a man. All the *Honor and Obedience* these men give, is not to *Spiritual Governors* who are so by the Institution of our Lord, Jesus, to whom alone the promise of the Assistance and Operation of the blessed Spirit is given, to Guide and Govern the Flock of Christ; but to them who enter not by the door, but climb up some other way, *i. e.* those, who are set up by their own Authority. That in many particulars these Dissenters differ from the Church of *England*, wherein she agrees with the Primitive Churches, doth by this time fully appear.

My using the words, *due Succession* here, doth not (as he pretends) sink the sense of an Uninterrupted Succession; for that cannot be called a *due Succession*, which is not an Uninterrupted Succession. So this is but a mere jingle.

I have before sufficiently proved the Government of the Church by Diocesan Episcopacy, to be the Institution of our Blessed Saviour, and that our Diocesan Bishops in the Church of *England* are invested with this Divine Authority by an uninterrupted Succession, and so are made our *Spiritual Rulers* by the same *Divine Authority*. Now these Dissenters having not this Divine Authority among 'em; it follows by my Adversary's acknowledgment, that the Dissenters in *England* want this *Qualification for Communion*, by which *Communion* must be understood the *Communion of Saints*.

In the same p. he says, *A single person taking upon him to Govern some Thousands of Congregations, by such Rulers and Officers as our English Prelacy uses, and this by the Nomination of the Civil Magistrate without the consent of the people, or the Ministers within the Diocess, is a Creature we find not in Scripture, nor in Primitive times, and therefore can be no Spiritual Governors of ours by Divine Right, &c.*

That the Jurisdiction of *English Prelates* is of *Divine Right* being proved, this *Creature* (as he scoffingly calls it) which he says, they *can neither find in Scripture, nor in Primitive times*, is evidently found in both, and

no other *Creature*, that is no other Government of the Church can be found in either; so that his objections against Congregations being numerous in a particular Diocese comes to nothing.

Their Rulers and Officers are mentioned before. But it is worth Observation to see, how the Regular Accession of a Bishop to his Diocese, is maliciously called by him, a *single Person taking it upon himself*, as if it were mere Usurpation.

But that which he seems to be much Scandalized at, is *their Nomination by the Civil Magistrate without the consent of the people, or the Ministers of the Diocese*. It it would not swell my papers too much, I could give him very many Instances to prove that for many Ages the *Nomination* of Bishops hath been in the Right of Christian Emperors and Christian Kings; and that it hath been so, very Anciently in *England*, and ther's great reason it should be so, for they were the Founders of Bishopricks; who else then can of Right lay claim to the Patronage of presenting to them? what confusion would be the result? how endless the Feuds and Animositys in every Diocese, were their Elections Tumultuary and Popular? By the Presbyters of the Diocese they are Elected, the Dean and Chapter in every Diocese being their Representatives, and this is to prevent Animosities and Divisions among the Clergie, in the Election of Bishops; and the Clergie or any other Person as well without, as within the Diocese have liberty to put in any Allegation they have against him, and the Crime, if proved Judicially, invalidates the Election and all proceedings therein. So that all their Quarrel in this, is only against the Ancient Right of the Crown, and the wisdom of the Clergie in preventing strife and contention.

That Diocesan Bishops are our *Spiritual Rulers by Divine Authority* being proved, answers all he says in his 32 and ends in his 33 P. His words are these, "When this man or any one for him, has made it appear that the Authority of a Diocesan Prelat, Dean, Lay Chancellor &c. over all in the Diocese is as Sacred as that of *Moses and Aaron*, we will not dare to dispute it for feare of *Corah's* doom &c. I hope he will not take it amiss if we be not frighted out of our wits by such misapply'd passages &c."

The Dean, Lay Chancellor &c. are Prudential Officers and have not a Divine but a Legal, tho' humane Authority; But the *Authority of a Diocesan Prelate*, conferr'd by, and derived from the Son of God must be as Sacred as that of *Moses and Aaron*, for the Apostle St. Paul in his Epist. to the *Hebrews* puts a far higher value and esteem upon the Evangelical than the Aaronical Priesthood; then certainly, to set up Congregations in defiance and combination against Evangelical Priesthood, viz. *Diocesan Prelacy*, is a Crime of as deep a Dy as that of *Corah* and his Congregation. Now tho

I have more Charity than to have these men *frighted out of their wits*, yet I heartily wish, that they may be *frighted* into a sense of their guilt and into a fear of disputing, the Crime being of the same Complexion with that of *Corah*; for altho God doth not now usually avenge himself, against such proud and obstinate Offenders as he did to *Corah* by the immediate execution of his Judgments, yet he hath reserved a Day, wherein his wrath against all despisers of his Authority and all other unrighteousnesses of obdurate and impenitent Sinners, will be revealed.

He says *Such misapply'd passages (viz. as that of Corah) they have often heard urged to back the Doctrin of Non-resistance and all those Principles of Slavery some men have been endeavouring to insill into our minds &c.*

Be the consequences what ever they may happen to be, the Doctrin of Non-resistance was the Doctrin of the Holy Apostles; These are the words of St. Paul, *Let every Soul be Subject to the Higher Powers, for there is no Power but of God: the Powers that be are Ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the Power, resisteth the Ordinance of God: and they that resist receive to themselves Damnation.* Rom. 13. 12. These Precepts of the Apostle are to continue eternally and are unalterable & irreversible by any human Authority whatsoever; To the observation wherof and obedience wherunto, all Christians are infallibly oblig'd. Now tho this *Gent.* may be above my advice, yet it will be his wisdom not to preach any Doctrin contrary to this Divine Precept; not only because it is contradicted by the Court of *Rome*, but because the Government will punish it as Seditious.

He says in Pa. 33. *In what Bounds he will fix the Primitive Church we know not; certain it is a Century or Two made a considerable change in the features of the Government and Worship &c.*

Let him and all his Fellow-Dissenters lay their heads together, and if they will be so kind to themselves, as to search the Histories of the Church, and the writings of the Fathers concerning the *Government and Worship* in the Church, and shew if they can, any *change in the Government and worship* in the three first Centuries, which until they perform my assertion stands firm. As for the *change of Government* which he so confidently affirms barely upon his own Authority and Fancy, is notoriously false, for what the *Government* was then, it has continued to be in all Catholic Churches to this day, so as that therein, there hath been no change at all.

But says he in Pa. 34. *If we must take our measures by these Churches that are truly Primitive, we fear not to put our selves to the Tryal &c.* Well! tho we have no Security that upon this Tryal they will stand to the Verdict, yet let it be Tried.

He says, *That our Congregations have this Agreement in Faith none will deny.* It is not the Agreement they have in their Congregations with one another that can make them Catholics, but Agreement with the Primitive Catholic Church, Dissenters agree not with the

In the truly Primitive Church, all true Christians did make a formal Profession of Faith, by distinctly repeating the Creeds with an audible voice, as we do in our Churches at this day, which practice seems to be intimated in St. Paul's Injunction to Timothy; *Hold fast the Form of sound Words which thou hast heard of me, &c.* What ever the Faith of these Separate Congregations may be, is unknown to us; the formal profession of Faith which was constantly used by the Primitive Christians, as the badge of Christianity, being in the Congregations of our Dissenters laid aside. Now that they in this respect agree with the truly Primitive Church must be denied. Primitive Church. 2 Tim. 1. v. 13.

He says, *I have not proved that they differ from the Catholic Church in the Essentials or integral parts of Gods Worship, or in any considerable Circumstance.*

2. In the truly Primitive Churches they held strict Communion with their Bishops, who were the Apostles Successors, and the Presbyters set over them by Episcopal Ordination and Institution, not only in Essential, but in all Circumstances in the Rites and Ceremonies of the Church also; as in the having all things common, to this they yielded Conformity: The Love Feasts, and the Holy-kiss, mere Ceremonies, no Essentials of Worship, yet enjoyed by the Apostles as significative of the ardent Love and Christian Charity, which Christians had for one another, and continued for some time after the Apostles days, till thro Corruption grown to be Scandal, and then, tho Instituted by the Apostles, were abolished by the Authority of the Church.

Now our Dissenters denying all Communion with our Bishops who are the Apostles Successors, and the Presbyters set over us by Episcopal Ordination and Institution; this, together with their Usurping the Priestly Office without Episcopal Ordination, sufficiently demonstrates that our Dissenters differ from the Primitive Catholic Church, in Essential, and considerable Circumstances, without any further trial.

In p. 34. he further saith, *And that this Divine Worship and Service is Visible and External, this Gent. is but too sensible, and tis a very great Eye-sore to such as he, that it is so much more visible than formerly it hath been.* That it is visible is true, but that it is Separate and out of the visible Catholic Church is a true.

He is pleased to call it Divine Worship and Service which it cannot be

Now let his other as vain and frivolous Objection be considered; viz. the *Imposing new and needless Terms*, by which is, I suppose, meant Ceremonies; I must here crave leave to mention what I have before; viz. the Love-feast, the Holy-kiss had no intrinsic vertue in them, were no Essentials of Religion (see his p. 2.) mere Ceremonies; and as this Gent. calls our Ceremonies, *without any native worth, or strength*, yet were made Terms of Communion in the Apostles days, and continued for some time after. The Ceremonies in our Church are of the same Nature; only have so much *worth and strength*, that they bear the pleasant fruit of Decency and Order; they are falsely called *New*, being Customs of great Antiquity in the Church, and being enjoyned by the same power derivatively which the Apostles had, (by my Adversariys good leave) cease to be needless: It necessarily follows, that all persons within the Jurisdiction of the *English Church*, have the same Obligation to submit to her Terms of Communion, as the Christians had to submit to the Terms of Communion with the Apostles: Seeing then, that there's nothing amiss in our Church *i. e.* not any thing that can give any just occasion to separate from her Communion: Seeing too, that She is a Church framed according to Scripture Rules, and that her Terms of Communion are neither New nor Needless; the Conclusion necessarily follows, that whoever they be within her Jurisdiction, that Separate from her Communion, do Separate for Separation sake, and have no other Motives thereunto, than those inward Vices of the mind, mentioned by Mr. *Hry.* viz. Ambition Animosity, &c. to close this; These men are **Notorious Schismatics** from their own Principles, & thereby give themselves the Title of Arch-Rebels in Christs Kingdom.

I will turn this Question upon the Dissenters, and Examine what account they can give of their being a *Church framed according to Scripture Rules*, and whether all they impose as Terms of Communion be *by express Rules in Scripture?*

That Church cannot be framed according to *Scripture Rules* where the Priestly Office is exercised without the Divine Mission; my Author may as truly affirm in respect of his natural Generation, that he is an immediate Son of *Adam*, as what he in his 31 p. affirms of Ordination, viz. that *their Spiritual Governors i. e.* their Pastors *derive their Authority from Christ*, which by the words subjoyned, must be immediately from Christ, for he says, *it is more proper than to speak of deriving it from the Apostles, &c.* No Commission was ever known to come immediately from Heaven without some extraordinary Testimony to evince the Truth of it. The immediate Mission which these men pretend to, requires an extraordinary Testimo-

Testimony, or no man in his right Wits can believe or assent to its Authority, or esteem it for any thing but mere Delusion, or Usurpation.

The *Cretian* Church must be allowed to be framed according to *Scripture Rules* (I keep to this Gentlemans term) in that Church, St. *Paul* appointed *Titus* to Ordain Elders in every City ; none in the *Scriptural Churches* (as this Gent. Phrales it) was to enter upon the Pastoral, or Priestly Office, without Episcopal Ordination. Our blessed Saviour saith, *Joh. 10. 1. Verily I say unto you, he that entreth not by the door into the Sheep-fold, but climbeth some other way, the same is a Thief and a Robber*: Not entring in at the Door signifies, entring without that Authority which the Author of our Religion hath Ordained in his Church; without this Mission, (i. e. Episcopal Ordination) no man hath Authority to Preach the Gospel, administer Sacraments, or exercise any thing appropriate to the Priestly Office; unless these men can manifest that they have this Mission, they are so far from being a *Scriptural Church*, that our blessed Saviour pronounceth them to be **Thieves and Robbers**. By this account of the Frame of their Church (supposing, but not granting it to be a Church) it appears to have no Foundation of a *Scriptural Church*, but on the contrary is Condemned in the Holy Scripture.

Let it now be examined whether All they impose as Terms of Communion, be by *express Rules in Scripture*?

1. *First*, Then I desire they'l inform us, where did our blessed Saviour, or his Apostles appoint the first day of the Week for Celebration of the Public Worship?

2. What precept have they in Scripture for choosing a Text as is now used to Preach upon, or the erection of a Pulpit?

3. What Divine Command have your Brethren for the Form of Public Penance, the Stool of Repentance, imposed by the Kirk of *Scotland* and the Presbyterians in *England*? These are I suppose, Terms of Communion with you; I am not disputing against the Practice of these things, but hence it appears how unreasonable and false, that Principle you so much contend for is, to wit; that nothing is to be done about the Worship and Service of God, without Rules and express Command in the Holy Scripture. But I farther demand of you,

4. What Divine Warrant, or where in Scripture did your Predecessors find those three significant Ceremonies, imposed without the Regal Authority, at the taking the **Solemn League and Covenant**, which you at this day justify? First the Takers must be uncovered. 2ly, they

must



Let the Reader consider all the parts together and then Judge, how reasonably *Congregational Bishops* can be hence inferr'd?

1. It is evident that *Polycarp* was not Bishop of one *Single Congregation* only; by these words, *call the Congregations together &c.* in the Plural Number.

2. His Jurisdiction and Authority over the Congregations, is manifest in these words, *Let nothing be done without thy Sentence.*

3. The Subjection due to the Bishop from these Congregations, contain'd in this Exhortation to them; *Be mindful of the Bishop that God may be mindful of you.*

4. The Distinction of the three Sacred Orders in the Church (about which these men have made such a bustle in the world) are plainly set down and overthrows all their pretensions to Congregational Bishops, for saith he, *I could give my life for those persons who are Subject to the Bishop, Presbyters and Deacons.* Here is a plurality of Congregations and a plurality of Presbyters and Deacons and but one Bishop. From his not reading, or concealing the most material parts in this Ep. wherein lye the true Sentiments of *St. Ignatius*, how Triumphantly does he conclude for *Congregational Bishops*; whereas the whole is altogether against it. Then he glories in the copious management of this Argument, by *Blundel, Baxter, Owen, Clarkson, and others*: Alas! all these have been judiciously Answered by *Bramhall, Hammond, Morris, Stillingfleet, Dodwell, &c.*

In his 36. p. saith he; *It is observable in the passage cited out of Irenaeus, the Presbyters are said to have their Succession from the Apostles*; and infers from thence, *that the Presbyters are the Apostles Successors as well as Bishops, and must consequently have the same power.*

How frequently in the writings of the Fathers, and in Scripture, are Bishops called Presbyters, as that word signifies Seniority or Dignity? and are not they sometimes called Deacons too? but as it would be very absurd to infer from hence an Equality of Bishops and Deacons, so would it be unreasonable to conclude concerning Bishop and Presbyter.

That our Author is mistaken in *St. Irenaeus's* sense of the word Presbyter, appears by the words immediately subjoyned, which are these; *Qui cum Episcopatus Successione Charisma veritatis certum, Secundum placitum Patris acceperunt.* Who (that is the Presbyters above mentioned) with the Succession of Episcopacy, have received the Infallible Gift of Truth according to the Will of the Father. It is plain that no other can be here ment, but those of the highest Order in the Church; Bishops.

My Author p. 37. accuseth me, that I designed not fair dealing with *Mr. H-ry*; it was a great omission in me, I therefore take his (tho' very sharp)

sharp) Rebuke very kindly. Mr. Hry in his 19 p. Parag. 6. very Orthodoxly saith: *Separation from Communion with those that we have joyned our selves to, without a Cause; give me leave to call it Separation for Separation sake, without any regard had to any thing amiss in the Church we Separate from, or any thing better in that we joyn our selves to; is Schism.* Then he proves the truth of this Proposition, from his own description of Schism; and then concludes, *When we quite cast off Communion with our Brethren out of Ambition, Animosity to their persons, affectation of Novelty and Singularity and the like.* Now our Author, lest this truth so plainly set down by Mr. Hry, should carry too sharp an edge upon 'em; in p. 37. brings in his Insinuation (as he in vain supposeth) to guard them from the stroke they must naturally receive from the applying of it to them: For (says he) *We all grant, that for persons wilfully to with-draw themselves from such particular Churches as are framed according to Scripture Rules, and impose no new and needless Terms, is to act Schismatically, because such wilfull Separation cannot be without the breach of Charity.* The difficulties which my Author (which indeed are none at all) would put, lyes in Churches framed according to Scripture Rules, &c. It is Schism in Mr. Hry's Judgment to Separate from a Church without any regard had to any thing amiss, Let it be Examined if in our Church there be any thing amiss?

Are not all the Articles of saving Faith truly taught? the Holy Sacra- No just ments duly Administred, the Moral precepts, and all the Rules of the cause of Christian Religion plainly and constantly recommended unto us, and prest Separation upon us for our Exercise in the whole Course of our lives, in the Sermons tion. of our Clergy in all our Churches? are not all things pertaining to a Godly Life and Salvation by our Church fully exhibited to us, so as that no man can miscarry but by his own fault? Here, then sure can be nothing amiss. Can these men maintain and justify then, the truth of their Doctrine, and separate themselves from us without pronouncing themselves Schismatics? either their Doctrine is not true, or these men are Schismatics in practice by their own shewing. All the false and shiftless pretence they have is, that the Church of England is not framed according to Scripture Rules, and imposeth new and needless terms, and therefore Separation from such a Church is no Schism.

That our Church is truly Apostolical, and as truly framed as Jerusalem, Antioch, Alexandria, and all other Primitive Churches according to Scripture Rules; according to Christ Jesus's own Institution, is fully proved in these papers. So that, that Objection is clearly Answered, and is indeed vain and frivolous.

I suppose but only in respect of the Object; when they have a lawful Spiritual Authority, that is Episcopal Ordination and Institution without which there can be no true Ministry (which I have prov'd) and consequently no true Ordinances, it may be called *Divine Worship and Service*, but till then, let they who are best able to judge, say what kind of Worship and Service it is. || *St. Ignatius* will resolve him in his Ep to the *Smym.*

He saith
it is a
Service
perform'd
to Satan.

That its *being more visible than formerly is a great Eye sore* to such as I am is a mistake. I have known it *more visible* than now it is; when all the Churches in the Kingdom were Usurped into the possession of the Presbyterians, Independents, Anabaptists, &c. (those were evil days) to see the Noble debased, the base and the vile made Rulers over us, Religion the pretence of Rebellion; the Church buried in Disgrace and Calumny, call'd the *Scarlet Whore*, &c. He was admired for the Holiest man, the greatest Saint, who was most improved in the Art of Reviling and *Speaking evil of Dignities*; the quitting Communion with a truly Catholic Church; the taking of a Rebellious Covenant (see his p. 54.) of human Composure, with significant Ceremonies; submitting to Lay Elders a Novelty not formerly known in the Christian Church; these, with many other Miseries and Calamities endured in those days, *were great Eye sores to me and such as I am.* But we have learned by the Doctrine which our Church Teacheth, Acquiescence and Submission to the Legislative Power; (a Lesson which our Dissenters could never yet put in practice) They have granted you a Toleration, and we are so far from envying it, that we Acquiesce and submit, so as to me and such as I am, it is no otherwise an *Eye sore*, than in Christian Charity to pity your mistakes, and heartily wish, that in your practice you would be more conformable to the Gospel of Peace, and that there be Peace in the end.

In his last Parag. p. 34. he says my asserting the Succession of Bishops from the Apostles, &c. *is inconsistent with other parts of my Book*, and (says) he *supposeth he hath sufficiently made it manifest*, and in p. 35. he calls my affirmations in my former paper, *Crude and Confused apprehensions*; he is so kind, as to plead *my capacity to excuse me for my Blunders*, (as he calls 'em) but says it *will by no means lessen the fault of my Officious and Confident intertineny, in meddling with things I so little understand.*

This is but Condemning me by the lump, and being past his skill to shew such *Inconsistency in my Book*, it is false, and those which he calls *my Blunders*, I have proved to be undeniable Truths; all the ill is, that what ever these men speak or write, be it ever so reproachful or false, their Disciples believe and swallow it for truth: But with Impartial men, Railing will never pass for Conviction, nor morose & uncharitable Censures for true

Judg-

Judgment; nor can the Imperious Language, he so liberally bestows upon me, add one mite to their Cause; nor one mite lessen that esteem (how undeserved soever) I have among many good men; but I have learned to forgive him, should he offend Seventy times seven.

Having made the Episcopacy Established in the Church of *England*, appear to be an exact paralel with the Catholic Churches in the Primitive times, what I mentioned of the Fathers, (in my p. 7.) holds good against my Adversary by his own Allowance, as you may see in his p. 35. at the bottom, his words are these. *We are no way concerned in the Citation of the Fathers brought in against us, till he has proved that Episcopacy then, was the same thing it is now, and that the Terms of Communion we scruple were ever imposed by them.* The former part, that the Episcopacy in our Church is the same as it was then, is proved.

That the having all things common, the Love-feasts and the Holy-kiss, were Ceremonies; no Essentials in Religion, yet were Terms of Communion in the Apostles time, being very plain: That the Ceremonies appointed by our Church, tho' they are not specifically the same (which this man seems to insist upon) yet being in Nature the same with those above mentioned. and being enjoynd by the same power and Authority derivatively, which the Apostles had; this Gent. or any other ought no more to scruple the Terms of Communion imposed by our Church, than the Primitive Christians did scruple the Terms of Communion imposed by the Apostles.

In the bottom of his 35 p. he says, Ignatius charges the Bishop, to take Cognizance of every Member of his Church, not excepting the very Servants, and that it was th. Custom then, in every Congregation to receive the Sacrament every Lords day, and that they never received it but from the Hand of the Bishop. Hence he concludes that such Bishops must be the Pastors of single Congregations; and adds, that this Argument has been copiously managed by Blundel, Baxter, Owen, Clarkson, and others.

This Gent. as in all other Quotations, leaves me to find this; I have met with the passage in St. Ignatius's Ep. to Polycarp Bishop of the Smyrna; where he saith, "Converse with all, man by man as God shall enable thee; he saith further, Let nothing be done without thy Sentence, &c. A little farther he saith, "Let Congregations be gather'd more frequently, and take the names of all Persons: Let neither Men nor Maid "Servants be despised by thee. And in the same Ep. he saith; "Be mindful of the Bishop, that God may be mindful of you. I could give my "Life for those persons who are Subject to the Bishop, Presbyters, and "Deacons.

must stand up. 3ly, The right hand must be lifted up bare; all these Ceremonies in this Religious Solemnity, signifying the Submission and Assent of the parties to that Rebellious Covenant, were Instituted by the Presbyterians.

In his 37 p. he says, *We desire the Rules of the Gospel may be carefully looked into, and a model of Government and Worship taken from thence, such as may be likely to answer the great ends of Church Societies, &c.* Here's our *Government and Worship* supposed to be inconsistent with the *Rules of the Gospel*; thence a necessity of Reformation; and who can deny so fair an Offer? *The Model* these good men will set up, shall be a *Model for Church Government and Worship* (not like our *Unscriptural Church*, but) taken from the *Rules of the Gospel*. But here its demanded.

5. What Rule or Command is there in all the Sacred Scriptures, for private and Unauthorized persons, such as these men are, under pretence of Reformation, to supplant a Catholic Church, truly Reformed in *Government and Worship*, to primitive purity (as I have shewed) and established by all the Authority that can be had on Earth from God or Man? Concocted men! Think ye that those Pious Martyrs who Reformed our Church inspected not the *Rules of the Gospel* as carefully and Conscientiously as you? and are not the *great ends of Church Society answered*, (viz.) the Christian Faith truly professed and maintained; the Holy Sacraments duly administered, and such an Unity and Christian Charity observed and practiced according to the Rules of the Gospel in our Church, as exactly and amply as in any Church on this side Heaven?

His next words in p. 38. are, *That nothing may be imposed but what is either expressly commanded; or has a natural and proper tendency to promote that which is so, &c.* This is Answered before.

He saith farther; *Then would the Worship and Service of God appear like it self, Rational, Grave and Majestical, becoming reasonable Creatures, &c.* Here are all men to be perswaded, that the Worship and Service in their Conventicles is eminently more *Rational, Grave and Majestic* than in our Churches. The truth of this will best appear from their practice.

None of their Addresses to K. James the second were presented, 'till the Composure and Form thereof, was deliberated and well weighed by more than One, by the whole Classis of a County: The Preacher saith, *Ecclesi. 5. 2. Be not rash with thy Mouth, and let not thine Heart be hasty to utter any thing before God, &c.* But they, in their Conventicles, Address the Majesty of Heaven, they rush upon and approach his presence, with the rash and Sudden thoughts of one single person, with a Prayer newly Coined, but whether Sterling; true, according to Standard, being never tryed, is un-

uncertain, for the people know it not, nor the Orator, till it be out; they shew'd more Fear and Reverence to an earthly King, than they dayly do to God Almighty. Is this Rational? Is this Grave?

In their Conventicles, at the reading the Holy Scriptures, among which the Psalms, consisting of the highest strains of Devotion, they Sit or Loll, and are covered; is this *Grave and Majestic*?

When the Minister (as they call him) offer up his (rash and unconsider'd) Prayers to God, the People are in confused, and irreverend postures, as if there were some unconcern'd and trivial thing in hand; is this *Grave and Majestic*?

He who Administers in their Divine Worship (as they call it) has no other Habit than what is due to, and becomes a Tradesman, or any other Layic in the Congregation (and indeed therein they are very modest; the Minister for the most part having no more claim to Priestly Garments than his Auditors) is this *Grave and Majestic*?

The truth is, these men are so humorfome, that what is *Rational* they condemn as Senceless; what is *Grave and Majestic*, they condemn for Superstition; and on the contrary, what is Rude, Irreverend and Foppish, they esteem as *Rational, Grave and Majestic*.

By this time it is very evident, that the Dissenters in England do Separate from a Church, wherein there is (to use Mr. H-ry's words) not any thing amiss; i. e. not any thing that can give any just occasion to Separate from her; and that the Communion (for I cannot call it a Church) or Society they joyn themselves to, is so far from being better, that in many Respects which I have mentioned, it is so much worse, that its absurdity to compare them.

The Inference then, drawn by Mr. H-ry from his own Proposition is clear. Mr. H-ry ly against them, that their Separation from our Church is clearly for Separation sake, and is necessarily an *Uncharitable Alienation of Affection*, and is consequently *Schismatical*.

Having also considered my Authors Notion of Schism; to wit, for persons wilfully to with-draw themselves from such particular Churches, as are framed according to Scripture Rules, and impose no new or needless Terms, is to act Schismatically, because such wilful Separation when no cause is given, cannot be without breach of Charity with our fellow-Christians, which is the Scripture Notion of Schism. Having shewed, that our Church is truly framed according to Scripture Rules, and that she imposeth neither New nor needless Terms; this Inference of his, is necessarily against them too, viz. That the wilfull with-drawing of these men from such a particular Church as our Church is, is to act Schismatically, &c. If any thing would prevail upon

the Obstinacy of these men, here is conviction from their own Reasoning.

I hope my fair dealing with Mr. *Hry* at this time, will make an Attonement for my former Omission, and allay my Adversaries bitter thoughts against me.

In my former paper, p. 7. I instanced the Authoritys of *Irenaeus*, *Ireneus*, *Cyprian*, and *Ambustus*, who were all Bishops and Martyrs, and agree, That for Christians to disobey their Bishops and Presbyters appointed & set over them; and to Separate from them, or to set up distinct Conventicles, is Formal Schism. Is not by this understood *diverity or Separation of Communion*? And is not this properly Schism? Yet for this my affirmation, he does in his 45 p. peremptorily charge me (and consequently these Pious Martyrs) with giving St. *Paul* the Lye. It St. *Paul* condemn'd the *Corinthians* for admiring, and barely pretending one Minister before another, of Schism; Shall that far greater and blacker Crime, the forsaking, and Separating from them, (to which the *Corinthians* were not then arriv'd) be excluded from Schism? Shall a cut in the Arm be truly call'd Schism or Scissure; and shall not the lopping off, and Separating the Arm from the Body, (which is the Dissenters Case) be accounted so? Wherein do I give St. *Paul* the lye? This Gent. is a topping Accuser.

The rest of his Book contains chiefly, Bitter Invectives, and Scurrilous Reflections; at his bitter reviling of me, I wonder not; But stand amaz'd at his hardyness, and indeed horrid and gross Impiety, with so much Venom and Malice, to rake into Royal Sepulchers, and render our Four Protestant Monarchs Infamous; see his p. 61. (of K. *Charles* the 2^d he saith) *not to be paralleld in Story.*

In Q. *Elizabeth's* Reign, our Church was again Reform'd; all the Innovations and Superstitions, which by a long series of time, the Church of *Rome* had introduced into the Church, and Consecrated with the Title of the *Old Religion*, abolished; the inestimable Blessing of the truly Ancient Catholick Religion, revived and established; this Religious Queen, and all those pious Prelates, to whom under God, the praise of all that Glorious work was due, escape not his malice, but in one breath blackens and defames them all; these are his words in p. 75. *That great Princess had something of the Sire in her, and there wanted not Prelatic breath to blow the Spark into a Flame.*

The Universal Fame this Great Princess had for Wisdom and Piety; the Turbulent Humor, and Insolent behaviour of the Dissenters towards Her, you have an account of, in Bish. *Burnet's* *Abridgement*, &c. the 4th Book, p. 381. Now notwithstanding, that this man saith in his 2^d p. "that Penal Laws had a quite contrary effect; and in his 3^d p. that they "have

"have not hitherto brought Protestants to an exact Uniformity; this Queen in the year 1592, made Penal Laws, which being Vigorously Executed, contrary to his maxims, had the good effects and proper ends for which they were made; suppress the Ring-leaders, and put an end to their Conventicles, and brought so many of them to Conformity, that during Her reign afterwards, she had no more disturbances from them; and this I suppose to be the chief incentive of this Male-content's displeasure against this Great and Matchless Princess.

In his 56 p. concerning K. James the first, he saith: *For when King James ascended Englands Throne, the Prelatic Party dreading lest the Puritans would have too great a share in his Favours, upon the account of his Education, and the Influence the Scottish Nobility and Ministry might have upon him, bent all their Studies to create a prejudice against them; and finding no bait was so like to take with him, as the extending of his Authority, and enlarging the Prerogative, &c. They Flattered the Ambition and Vices of that Prince, and thereby made him intirely their own.*

To shew how false this Affirmation is, I will here set down the Opinion which that Learned and Judicious Prince, had of the Scottish Puritans, from a long experience; Published and declared in Print at Edinburgh, some years before his Accession to the Throne of England. He calls the Presbyterian Government, *an imagined Democracy*; and saith, "That they BAZI-
"described themselves with the hope to become *Tribuni Plebis*; and so in a ΔΙΚΟΝ
"popular Government, by leading the people by the Nose, to bear the ΔΩΡΟΝ
"sway of all the Rule, &c. And a little farther: "Take heed therefore p. 39.
"my Son, to such Puritans, very pests in the Church and Common-weal; p. 41.
"whom no deserts can oblige, neither Oaths nor Promises bind; breath- p. 42.
"ing nothing but Sedition and Calumnies; aspiring without Measure,
"rayling without Reason, &c. And a little farther, after comparing them
"to His land, or Border-Thieves for ingratitude, Lying and Perjuries, he
"saith; "And suffer not the Principals of them to brook your Land, if
"you like to sit at rest: except ye would keep them for trying your Pa-
"tience, as Socrates did an evil Wife.

Now had this man the least grain of Shame or Modesty, common to Human Nature, he would never have exposed himself to so plain and known a contradiction: *That the English Prelates flatter'd him into an ill Opinion of the Puritans*, is so far from being true, that it was founded upon his own Experience, and Published long before he had any converse with the *English Prelates*. And that he should accuse that King of *Ambition and Vices*, who was so eminently Famous for Piety and Virtue, is horridly wicked. Here is great Reason for this man to conceal his name.

Against K. *Charles* the first, he musters up a Roll of all the hainous Crimes he can Imagin, which I could answer particularly, but for his Vindication from this man's malicious Column; it is sufficient to refer the Reader to the Rolls and Acts of Parliament (of which he mentions not a word) and all other Transactions which passed in his time, not yet out of memory. What did that *Parliamentum Insanum* ask, which He did not grant, except the Tower of *London* and the Militia; which because he thought it too unreasonable to Separate from the Monarchy, they Seized by Violence: Never was a King so fond of pleasing a Parliament (witness His passing the Bill for not Dissolving them without their consent) and never were there such ungrateful returns; He desired & studied the Peace & Tranquillity of the Nation, and they were for hurrying it into Convulsions and Rebellion: He was for preserving and maintaining the Church, in all Her Ancient just Established Rights, and they for destroying both Her and Him. They indeed contriv'd and gave him Opportunities, to his *Eternal* fame, to shew how eminently the Grace of God was in him; never did any Prince, since the Prince of Peace, shew more Christian Courage, Patience, Meekness, and Humility, even to the Admiration and Astonishment of His most Barbarous and Cruel Enemies. Now whilst this man contracts the guilt of the Murder of this Royal Martyr, by justifying all those irregular and Horrid proceedings of the Presbyterians which brought it about, I do heartily with all good men keep the Anniversary Fast and pray with our Church, that His memory may be ever blessed among us: and that this Land may be freed from the Vengeance of his blood &c. Here is Sufficient reason for this man to conceal his name.

The Violation of Promises, which in that 61. *ps.* he charges upon the Church and Court party upon the Restauration, can be nothing else but Fiction and Forgery, to prove which, greater Evidence cannot be for any thing, than the Acts of that Parliament which K. *Charles* the 2^d. immediately called; upon whom, without Reserve he rely'd, not only to reform and forgive all the Irregularities, but to renew the very Foundations, and to Re-establish the Government of Church and State; both which, were Overturned and laid in Rubbish, by an Unnatural Rebellion fomented and carried on, by the Presbyterians and their Adherents, (Witness their Illustrious **Solemn League and Covenant**) and accordingly all things were by that Parliament Re-established and confirmed, to the satisfaction of the Nation in General; and this was the Confirmation of that Treaty at *Breda*. Where now is the Violation of Promises? The audacious Reflections of this man, Loaden with so much Malice, against our Four Protestant Monarchs; is rather the Character of a Jesuit, than of any other

So.

Society,
for the
complai
tongue.

But E
that un
on the T
these m
Hypocr
erially
Panigy
Interest

That a
in Relig
of a Kir
the Diss
bout m
maxim

In his
y, eith
in bre
answer

To th
ine inf
ers, be

y necess
ly the
must be
our sen
ent, I
rs of c
ou call
struct
et so c
sary
ere to

But a
he Prie
St. J
Sh

Society, it is so like them. This man Conceals his Name, and let it be so; *for the Name of the Wicked shall rot*, Prov. 10. I will close this with the complaint of the Royal Prophet; *What shall be done unto thee O thou false tongue*. Psal. 10. 7.

But Blessed be God, says he in ps. 62. *We have a King upon the Throne, that understand's, and loves the true Interest of England, &c.* It is well He is on the Throne, and God grant him long to be so; But who can account themselves praisers to a King on the Throne, for any thing but Flattery and Hypocrisy, that knows five years are not yet expired, since these men universally Flatter'd King *James*, with Hofannas far beyond this, in their Panegyrics to him, when on the Throne. But would you know the true Interest of *England*? Learn of him who intalibly understood it, He saith, *That a Kingdom divided against it self cannot stand*. Mar. 3. 24. Unity in Religion being the Surest Bulwark, and the most approved preservative of a Kingdom from dividing, is certainly the truest Interest of *England*; the Dissenters therof, who creat Divisions, making Patties and Factions about matters not Essential to Religion, according to our blessed Saviour's Maxim, neither understand nor love the true Interest of *England*.

In his 66. p. he saith, *We hold Communion with you in all that's necessary, either to the Being or Welfare of a Church, and by your unnecessary Trifles, we break with us, and not we with you, if any breach there be.* To which answer.

To the Being of a Church, it is necessary that the Government be of Divine Institution, which I have shew'd to be Episcopacy; And that the Members be United in a peaceable Subjection to the Government, is absolutely necessary to the Being and Welfare of a Church; for without this, not only the Peace, which is the Welfare, but the very Being of a Church, must be Dissolved and Swallowed up in Division and Confusion. Now our setting up a Government Distinct and Opposit to the Ancient Government, Established in the Church, than which the blessed Saints and Martyrs of old knew no other, and under pretence of *Unnecessary Trifles*, (as you call 'em) to withdraw all Obedience and Subjection, which is plainly destructive, not only to the Welfare, but the very Being of a Church, and yet so confidently to affirm, you hold Communion with us in all that's necessary thereunto, is to impose upon our very Senses; and to believe it, were to degenerate into Senseless Brutes.

But alas! should the Church condescend to gratifie your Humor, strip the Priest of his Habit, the Emblem of Innocency, the Colour of the Robes in *St. John's Vision*, and in which all the Messengers from Heaven appear'd? Should she for your sake, abandon the Sign of the Cross, so anciently used

used in all Catholic Churches? Should she yield to rob her Members of their Ancient Right; by Cancelling and Obliterating the Liturgy, which for Matter and Order how useful and necessary for Public Devotion, let it self Testifie? And instead thereof allow Extemporary Prayers, which, what crude and indigested matter for the most part they are, we have heard and know; and which cannot possibly without the Stamp of Authority (which they are not capable of) or be made appear to be the dictates of the Spirit, tho' pronounced before Ten thousand people, bear the Title of Public or Common Prayers. Should she prohibit Kneeling, and enjoyn us like Clowns and Bankins, to sit when we Celebrate the Commemoration of the Death and Passion of our blessed Redeemer in the Eucharist? Should she forbid bowing in our Devotion, at the saving name of Jesus, & paying Corporal Adoration to God Almighty, which the very light of Nature teacheth? And should she abolish all which you assion inly call Trifles? Alas! She must betray her Trust, and level the Priest-hood; she must Surrender and part with the Government established by Divine Institution, or you will never be satisfied; this is evident in the whole strain of your Book, and is the avowed and Darling Principle of all Dissenters, of what persuasion soever; were their Divisions more numerous than the points in the Compass, yet they will all agree and Center in this, *viz.* the Expulsion of Diocesan Bishops from the Government of the Church: not considering that they contend and strive against the Ordinance of God, *the Care and Charge of all the Churches*, being intrusted and committed to them; and who thro' all Ages from the Apostles, as faithful Over-seers of the Church of God, have handed down, and delivered to us, the Holy Scriptures, the Articles of Faith, the holy Sacraments, and all that's Sacred, and conducive to Holiness, Unity and Charity here, and to that future happy Estate of perfect Holiness and Unity Eternal hereafter. Ungrateful men! is their Extermination and Destruction a meet reward for conveying to us such inestimable Blessings? Are ye the meek Servants of the meek and Holy Jesus, who murmur and Rebel against them that bear his Authority? Can ye be the Disciples of Christ, who abjure and declare against his Ambassadors? Or can ye be esteemed the Subjects of the Prince of Peace, who sow the Seeds of Contention, and are the Authors of Separation, of Division and Confusion in the Church of God? No, no, He hath founded our Religion in Charity and Unity, in Peace and Obedience; and no one can be his Disciple, who is a violator of Christian Charity, making no Conscience (under pretence of Conscience) to disturb the Peace, and dissolve the Unity of the Church, not only by disobeying the Governors thereof, in those things which our Savior having left indifferent, hath left in their Power to impose and

and C
tirpati
If any
the Se
the Co
and d
Flock.
by del
ing an
hurry
who b
how d
who a
selves
Th
sume
Mind
your o
Comm
ry to
be W
dity,
ons, a
riors,
cern'd
which
call it
with a
Law
ness,
hope
a Res
gan w
clude
God o

and Command; but by despising them, and endeavouring their utter Extirpation. *As the Tree is known by its Fruit*, so are you by your Works; If any have been Guilty of Schism ever since the Ascension, or can be 'till the Second Advent of our Lord, our Dissenters are manifestly so. And as the Censure of the Church, judicially pronounced against Scandalous, Leud, and disorderly persons, excludes them from the Congregation of Christ's Flock, which St. Paul calls, *delivering up unto Satan*. So these Dissenters, by despising and renouncing the Government of the Church, by withdrawing and Separating themselves from Communion with her, involve and hurry themselves willfully, into the same State and Condition with those, who by judicial Sentence are put out of the Congregation of Christ's Flock; how deplorable soever it is to be so, this is the true state of the Case of all who as our Dissenters, are guilty of Criminous Schism, they exclude themselves from the **Catholic Church**.

The Holy Scriptures abound with Remedies against this, but I will presume to mind them only of these, prescribed by St. Paul. The first is; *Mind not high things, but condescend to men of low Estate; be not Wise in your own conceits*. Now not to submit in things Indifferent, which being Commanded by our Lawful Governors, are made a Duty, is very contrary to this Command of *condescending to men of low Estate*. And they must be *Wise in their own Conceits*, who occasion the breach of Charity and Unity, by preferring and obstinately contending for their own private Opinions, against the deliberate and United Councils and Decrees of their Superiors, in those things wherein the Essentials of Religion are not the least concern'd. The next is, *Follow Peace with all men, and Holiness, without which, no man shall see the Lord*; Holiness is but pretence, and if I may call it so, mere Pageantry in Religion, in those who do not *follow Peace with all men*, much more in them who will not be at Peace with their Lawful Spiritual Governors; for he who hath not Peace as well as Holiness, shall never see God. And now more full of Charitable desires, than hope of the Conviction of these men to Christian Peace and Unity, with a Resolution never to give them any more trouble of this kind; as I began with our Saviours Command, and Blessed Legacy of Peace, so I conclude with St. Paul's Exhortation; *Be of one mind, live in Peace, and the God of Peace shall be with you*.

F I N I S.

1775

The following is a list of the names of the persons who have been
 appointed to the office of Justice of the Peace for the County of
 Middlesex, in the year 1775. The names are arranged in alphabetical
 order, and are taken from the original list, which is now deposited
 in the office of the Clerk of the Peace for the County of Middlesex.
 The names are as follows:

1. Mr. John Smith
 2. Mr. John Doe
 3. Mr. John Roe
 4. Mr. John Green
 5. Mr. John White
 6. Mr. John Black
 7. Mr. John Grey
 8. Mr. John Brown
 9. Mr. John Gold
 10. Mr. John Silver
 11. Mr. John Copper
 12. Mr. John Lead
 13. Mr. John Iron
 14. Mr. John Tin
 15. Mr. John Zinc
 16. Mr. John Nickel
 17. Mr. John Cobalt
 18. Mr. John Manganese
 19. Mr. John Potash
 20. Mr. John Soda
 21. Mr. John Ash
 22. Mr. John Lime
 23. Mr. John Salt
 24. Mr. John Oil
 25. Mr. John Vinegar
 26. Mr. John Honey
 27. Mr. John Butter
 28. Mr. John Cheese
 29. Mr. John Bread
 30. Mr. John Wine
 31. Mr. John Beer
 32. Mr. John Ale
 33. Mr. John Rum
 34. Mr. John Brandy
 35. Mr. John Gin
 36. Mr. John Tobacco
 37. Mr. John Coffee
 38. Mr. John Tea
 39. Mr. John Sugar
 40. Mr. John Spice
 41. Mr. John Pepper
 42. Mr. John Mustard
 43. Mr. John Horseradish
 44. Mr. John Turnip
 45. Mr. John Cabbage
 46. Mr. John Lettuce
 47. Mr. John Spinach
 48. Mr. John Peas
 49. Mr. John Beans
 50. Mr. John Lentils
 51. Mr. John Chickpeas
 52. Mr. John Onions
 53. Mr. John Potatoes
 54. Mr. John Carrots
 55. Mr. John Parsnips
 56. Mr. John Turnips
 57. Mr. John Celeriac
 58. Mr. John Cauliflower
 59. Mr. John Broccoli
 60. Mr. John Brussels Sprouts
 61. Mr. John Kale
 62. Mr. John Spinach
 63. Mr. John Peas
 64. Mr. John Beans
 65. Mr. John Lentils
 66. Mr. John Chickpeas
 67. Mr. John Onions
 68. Mr. John Potatoes
 69. Mr. John Carrots
 70. Mr. John Parsnips
 71. Mr. John Turnips
 72. Mr. John Celeriac
 73. Mr. John Cauliflower
 74. Mr. John Broccoli
 75. Mr. John Brussels Sprouts
 76. Mr. John Kale
 77. Mr. John Spinach
 78. Mr. John Peas
 79. Mr. John Beans
 80. Mr. John Lentils
 81. Mr. John Chickpeas
 82. Mr. John Onions
 83. Mr. John Potatoes
 84. Mr. John Carrots
 85. Mr. John Parsnips
 86. Mr. John Turnips
 87. Mr. John Celeriac
 88. Mr. John Cauliflower
 89. Mr. John Broccoli
 90. Mr. John Brussels Sprouts
 91. Mr. John Kale
 92. Mr. John Spinach
 93. Mr. John Peas
 94. Mr. John Beans
 95. Mr. John Lentils
 96. Mr. John Chickpeas
 97. Mr. John Onions
 98. Mr. John Potatoes
 99. Mr. John Carrots
 100. Mr. John Parsnips

FINIS

